

The Christian Statesman

Vol. XLIX.

MAY, 1915.

No. 5

The Outlook

The liquor traffic is certainly receiving a great many hard blows in the present hour. The fight against it is being pushed with great vigor; and the opposition comes not only from ecclesiastical and reform sources but from commercial and political circles. One of the latest arraignments of this enemy of men and of society is certain words used by the Supreme Court of Mississippi in connection with a decision upholding a law prohibiting the keeping of intoxicants in social clubs. The court quoted the following vigorous words: "Whisky is a good thing in its place. There is nothing like it for preserving a man when he is dead. If you want to keep a dead man, put him in whisky; if you want to kill a live man, put whisky in him."



A recent number of the Outlook journal discusses in a paragraph certain disturbed conditions in connection with the University of Utah, to which some reference was made in our last issue. Four professors were some time ago dismissed, and one other demoted. Petitions were sent to the Board of Regents for investigation, but this body declined to accede to these requests, and this statement was adopted: "The Board is best able to decide how and when it will obtain its information, what it considers the most

reliable information, and how it will conduct its investigations; this it has always done and proposes to continue so to do." Following this remarkable attitude of a body of men representing a State institution, fourteen members of the faculty resigned; and the Outlook appropriately remarks: "If the people of Utah have any respect for their University, they will not rest until a thorough investigation has authoritatively disclosed the facts in this extraordinary chapter of university history. It concerns the whole Nation. The connection of the Mormon church needs especially to be made clear. It is a significant fact that all the men who have been dismissed or who have resigned are non-Mormons."



It is interesting to note that the Mormon church has recently made, according to a press announcement, the first public financial statement ever issued by the church. It was presented in the Tabernacle before the annual conference. According to this report the church collected \$1,887,920 from tithes in 1914. We wonder if this is the total from that source. It would be interesting, no doubt, also to the public if some announcement were made as to the sugar holdings and railroad interests of the church. The above report claimed a net increase in the member-

The University of Utah

Mormon Growth

ship of the church of 129,493 from 1901 to 1914, a birth rate of 39.5 per thousand, a death rate of 8.3 per thousand, and a marriage rate of 17 per thousand in 1914. Throughout the world 1,316 men and 115 women are engaged in missionary work; 14,717 Mormon children were born in 1904; 73 per cent of the families in the church own their own homes, and 319,000 members of the church were born in the United States. The total membership is not given.

The membership, according to the World Almanac, is 296,000 for the Utah Mormon church, though the figures are marked as those of 1912. The same source of information gives the membership of the Reorganized branch as 60,000. Whatever the full membership of the great church, the Utah branch, it must be admitted that this Mormon Kingdom, for such it is, with Joseph Smith as the head, is one of the most compact, powerful, aggressive, and successful organizations in the world. It aims to control this Republic, and it is making progress in that direction.



As intimated in our last issue Rev. William Sunday at times preaches some very strong social doctrine. He believes that Christianity is not only for the individual but for the community. In a recent sermon at Philadelphia on "The Inner Wall," he asserted emphatically, perhaps in form somewhat condensed by the reporter, that Philadelphia, like Babylon and other ancient cities, would go to hell no matter how advanced in education, in culture, or in art, unless it had religion.

Babylon, that great city of the Orient, failed to build an inner wall, and now you dig in the rubbish for its grandeur. Greece flashed, scintillating and meteor-like, across the stretches of the Aegean Sea. Pericles gave her her statesmanship, Phidias her art, Socrates her drama and Demosthenes her oratory. Where is Greece now? Look in the pages of Strabo. Rome had her Caesar, her Nero, her Diocletian; her legions were everywhere. Where is she now? Gibbon will tell you. Jerusalem, that proud, templed city of Palestine, Jesus Christ stood in old Jerusalem and said: "You spit upon me, you damned me, you cursed me. Not a stone of your city shall hold its place." But they said, "Away with you." Where is Jerusalem now? If we have education, have art, have culture and have not Christianity, then I say to you that Philadelphia, like Babylon, like Greece, like Rome, like Jerusalem, will go to hell. Unless America's purity of heart keeps pace with her brilliancy of intellect, America will go to hell. You're kicking the Bible out of the schools—you'll go to hell if you do. The man who is ignorant and is a Christian is a better citizen than the man who is educated and is not a Christian. The street cleaner who believes in God is a better American than the brilliant professor who scoffs at religion. Education, if divorced from religion, leads to the spread of depravity and the destruction of the basic element of Christian civilization.



The vastness of the European struggle receives fresh illustration in a recent press item of a compilation made by the *Matin* of Paris as to the present total length of battle fronts in the war. In the western arena, according to these figures, the French occupy 540 miles of trenches, the British 31, and the Belgians 17 miles. That seems very few for the British, but this paper may understand the situation. In the

Vastness of the War

eastern theater of war the Russians face a front of 851 miles, and the battle line of the Servians and Montenegrins is 217 miles in length. The total length of battle fronts then is 1,656 miles.

Another illustration from another point of view is the estimate of Mr. Edgar Crammond on "The Cost of the War," in an address before the Royal Statistical Society, in London, as quoted by the London Weekly Times. Mr. Crammond's estimate of the direct and indirect cost of the war up to July 31 next, on the assumption of continued active and universal hostilities, is the appalling total of over 9,000,000,000 pounds. This includes both sides. The total cost to the Allies he estimates as about 4,870,000,000 pounds, and the cost to their opponents as 4,277,000,000. These figures do not include the losses of Japan, Servia, or Turkey, and the losses and expenditures of neutral powers traceable to the war. These great losses are classed under four heads by the statistician: direct expenditure of government, destruction of property, capitalized value of loss of life, and loss of production and other losses. With the third department here mentioned left out, Mr. Crammond's figures would indicate a total cost in one year of over seven billion pounds, or about thirty-five billion dollars! Such figures stagger the human comprehension. When will the world recover from this extraordinary and inconceivable waste of resources?



There is some danger that we may grow indifferent to the long-continued accounts of the terrible sufferings that are caused by the European War, or are following in its wake; and that the generous

**Suffering in
Servia**

hand of prosperous America may relax somewhat in its efforts to relieve these sufferings. Not only does the cry of want come from Belgium and Poland, but also from stricken Servia, who is suffering not only from hunger but disease. It is said that famine and pestilence are claiming many that shot and shell had spared. The typhus fever had some time ago taken already 60,000 victims. In one day during the second week in February there were 450 deaths reported from typhus in the city of Nish alone. Sir Thomas Lipton, the tea merchant, has been in Servia recently, and refers thus to a place called Ghevgheli:

The place is a village in a barren, uncultivated country, the hospital an old tobacco-factory, formerly belonging to Abdul Hamid. In it were crowded 1,400 persons, without blankets or mattresses, or even straw—men lying in the clothes in which they had lived in the trenches for months, clothes swarming with vermin; victims of different diseases—typhus, typhoid, dysentery, and smallpox—were herded together. In such a state Dr. Donnelly found the hospital, where he had a force of six American doctors, twelve American nurses, and three Servian doctors. When I visited the hospital three of the American doctors, the three Servian doctors, and nine of the nurses were themselves ill. The patients were waited on by Austrian prisoners. The fumes of illness were unbearable. The patients objected to the windows being opened, and Dr. Donnelly was forced to break the panes. The first thing Dr. Donnelly did on his arrival was to test the water, which he found infected. He then improvised boilers of oil-drums, in which to boil water for use. The boilers saved 500 lives, said Dr. Donnelly. He also built ovens in which to bake the clothes of the patients, but he was not provided with proper sterilizing apparatus.

It is sad to note that Dr. James F. Donnelly, of the American Red Cross, the one here mentioned, has since died, apparently in this same hospital. The Servian Archbishop Demetrius, Metropolitan of the little kingdom, has made an appeal. He states that during the long war a great many adult Servians have been killed, or disabled, and that for those who have escaped, and for the orphans of the fallen, speedy help is most necessary. An American sanitary commission has perhaps been organized already by the American Red Cross and the Rockefeller Foundation to attack the typhus fever epidemic; and both of these organizations have donated money to this work; but large additional funds will no doubt be necessary for this purpose and to aid the poor. Dr. Lane, recently returned from Servia, reports that of the six physicians and twelve nurses sent to Servia by the American Red Cross, all but four have contracted typhus. Contributions for combatting this fever can be sent to J. P. Morgan & Co., New York City, marked "Servian Sanitary Relief," with perhaps a little additional explanation of their purpose. Typhus fever is said to be even worse than smallpox and spreads rapidly.



Our Chief Magistrate and his advisers, in this hour of international tension and uncertainty, are entitled to the earnest support of every true American. They deserve our sympathy, co-operation, and prayer. Never since the days of Lincoln have such serious problems confronted the President of our country. We are not satisfied with the conduct of the war, on the part of either England or Germany, as far as it con-

cerns outside nations, and our State department has been saying so. Just now Germany seems quite dissatisfied with certain things on our part; and it would be very easy to create a disturbing situation in a short time with either one of these great warring nations. Moreover, Japan's apparently arrogant attitude to China, who looks to the United States as a great friend, produces another somewhat delicate international situation. Shall we allow this giant awakening out of his long sleep to be fettered before he obtains full control of his hands and faculties? How far should we go in protest; and how far should we not go? The Mexican situation, too, at our very doors, is not improving. It is a condition of political chaos. There is no unified government, and prosperity and life are not safe. Our proximity gives us a peculiar responsibility. We have already presumed at different times to give advice and warning, and have even gone to the extent of temporary invasion. The question of how far we should go rests in great measure with our national leaders. Whether we agree with every method heretofore followed or proposed concerning any of the countries named, it is clear that we should refrain from putting any obstacles in the way of right action, and we should stand loyally behind our President in an hour of great international moment. He is earnestly opposed to war. He is carefully using his great ability and official resources to guide our ship of state in a righteous, safe, and honorable course through the present troubled waters. We can be very sure that the President and his Secretary of State are spending many long and anxious hours over the problems arising from the present European

situation; and that they are making earnest effort not only to guard our own national welfare and honor, but also to be fair and just with their warring neighbors. We are glad that our Chief Magistrate is careful, just, and courageous; and specially in all his efforts to prevent our country's being involved in this great conflict, let us stand behind him and wish him God-speed!



A very earnest demonstration was made by temperance leaders from different parts of the State at Harrisburg recently in favor of the

Local Option
Hearing

local option bill pending at this date in the legislature. Several mass meetings were held during the day, and a large mass meeting was held at night. A special hearing took place before the law and order committee of the house on the afternoon of the same day. Four speakers were heard on each side. The night mass meeting in favor of the bill was addressed by United States Senator George T. Oliver, Governor Martin Brumbaugh and others. The Governor said: "The issue now joined is a plain and fair one. The Williams local option bill is, I submit, a perfectly fair and reasonable measure. It is not a wet or dry measure. Only false men and ignorant men will hold this. The whole issue is, Shall the people themselves have the right once in three years to decide for themselves whether or not licenses shall issue for the sale of intoxicants in the several counties of Pennsylvania. If you believe in the rule of the people, if you can trust the people, if you are a real American, you cannot deny the fairness of this proposition." The Governor made a

determined and earnest effort to secure the passage of the bill, and had it passed, a great deal of the credit would have had to be attributed to him.

Local Option is not ideal. It is not the best and highest method of dealing with the liquor question. It is merely allowing the people the privilege of dealing locally with the saloon one way or the other. It may be that we should rather demand of our legislators that, in harmony with the functions for which they are chosen, they enact a State prohibition law, or give the people the opportunity for a constitutional amendment. Local option is also too limited. The great aim should be State, or better still, national prohibition. We cannot cure a general disease by local treatment. Moreover, some apparently prefer local option as a convenient half-way stopping place. It is not so radical. It keeps this disturbing question out of national and State politics. Senator Oliver, whose *Gazette-Times* and *Chronicle-Telegraph* refuse all liquor advertisements, may be a prohibitionist, but some of his words, at Harrisburg, if he is appropriately quoted, suggest the half-way method at least for the present. He said there are only three ways of handling the liquor traffic, regulation, restriction, and prohibition. Up to this time Pennsylvania has confined herself to regulation, but mere regulation no longer satisfies the popular demand and some more drastic measure must be adopted or State prohibition will result. The question of to-day is, What middle course can be followed? Pennsylvanians are naturally conservative, and they never resort to radical measures unless it is absolutely necessary. All of which suggests the question, Does the Senator desire local

option only, or, Does he desire it as a step to State prohibition?

However, local option has much that can be said in its favor. It is a democratic measure. It allows temperance people the privilege of driving saloons some distance from their doors. The acceptance of the privilege does not imply the denial of a higher aim for State and National prohibition. The acceptance of the half loaf—or quarter—is no promise that the whole will not be required. Local option may pave the way for prohibition on a large scale. A local option law will be more readily secured now than any other temperance measure; and if it is secured, there is no doubt that it will drive the saloon out from many of the counties of our great State. And if such success does crown its efforts, let us hope that the results achieved, the new sentiment created, the new encouragement thus acquired, will produce such a tide of moral sanitation as will sweep the accursed grog shops from the great commonwealth of Pennsylvania.



Mr. Bryan, Secretary of State, made an address not long since on total abstinence at Philadelphia under the auspices of the National Abstiners' Union. It is noteworthy and encouraging that one of the highest officers in our government should take such a stand as Mr. Bryan does on the use of liquor. His refusal to serve liquors at public functions in his home at Washington is specially deserving of recognition. He is no friend to the liquor interests, and it is highly desirable that a man of his ability, position, and influence, with breadth of vision and

strong convictions on the temperance question, shall identify himself more fully with legal efforts for the suppression of the traffic. Perhaps, however, he will soon take a higher and more positive stand on the legal aspects of temperance. In a letter to a National Democratic Committeeman, apparently of Iowa, Mr. Bryan recently used the words: "If, therefore, anybody asks you my opinion, you may say that in any contest between a wet and a dry candidate for national committeeman I am for the dry candidate, and that I shall be greatly disappointed if the Democratic party in Iowa does not throw the weight of its great influence against the liquor interests and all that they stand for or desire." It would be a noble stand and one of great help to the country, if Mr. Bryan would announce himself flatly for national prohibition. His words on total abstinence, on the occasion above mentioned, are well worth considering, and will appeal, in a special way, to the young men of our country. On the assumption that the people of this country spend nearly two and one half billion dollars annually for strong drink Mr. Bryan points out that our annual drink bill would carry on the gigantic European war for six weeks at its cost of over fifty million dollars a day; that it amounts to about six times the cost of the Panama Canal, which was about four hundred million dollars; that we spend for drink more than three times what we spend for education; that the annual appropriations of the Federal Government, which include the salaries of all public officials from the President down, the salaries and expenses of our Ambassadors and Ministers, the cost of our consular service, the expenses of the treasury, the army, the navy, and fur-

nish money for the post office department, for the interior department, the agricultural department, and other branches of the government, are less than a billion and a quarter of dollars, or one half only of our annual drink bill. According to the estimate given the average tax imposed on each citizen by liquor is over twenty-five dollars a year, or over one hundred and twenty-five dollars for a family of five. Mr. Bryan said in the course of his address, which is published in a neat booklet by the National Abstainers' Union, Charles Scanlon, General Secretary, National Abstainers' Union, First National Bank Building, Pittsburgh, Pa.: "I spoke a few nights ago to eight hundred and fifty midshipmen at the Annapolis Naval Academy, and a finer body of young men it would be impossible to find. Not one of them is permitted to use intoxicating liquors. Why is the use of liquor forbidden to these men except on the ground that it would be hurtful to them? They are being prepared at government expense for government service and the fact that they are not permitted to use alcohol should impress all young men who seek to fit themselves for important work."

Mr. Bryan gave his hearers on this occasion an interesting account of the origin of the pledge which was to be presented to them that evening. As he was about to leave Nebraska, after the last election, he persuaded a friend to sign along with him a pledge beginning: "We, the undersigned, promise, God helping us," etc. Afterwards four thousand boys, through a representative, sent the speaker an invitation to address them at Ann Arbor. The invitation had been circulated on separate blanks and then bound in book form. Each invitation began:

"We, the undersigned," etc. The similarity of language recalled the pledge which he and his Nebraska friend had together signed, and he presented this pledge to the boys in Ann Arbor. The meeting was made up of delegates from the high schools of more than three hundred cities in the State, and the delegates took the pledge home with them and circulated it. Already more than ten thousand have signed. "It has never been any trial for me," said the Secretary of State, "to abstain from the use of liquor, but even if total abstinence had been difficult, it would be ample compensation to know that I may be useful in saving from the drink habit some of the young men of Michigan, who, without the pledge, might yield to the temptation." How fine it would be for our young men and for the whole nation, if all our public men would take such a stand against strong drink!



The earnest efforts being put forth in the State of Pennsylvania by temperance leaders for local option, and

Method of Dealing with the Liquor Question

the progress of prohibition in other States, bring into view more prominently the question of the best legal attitude in dealing with the saloon. From one viewpoint, all the methods of dealing with the traffic in strong drink may be included under the heads of freedom, regulation, restriction, and suppression. The whole subject may be also considered from the view-point of certain concrete methods. We might have, for example, free whisky. It could be bought and sold without any restriction, any more than in the case of boots and shoes, or groceries. As many as wished might

engage in the business. If liquor selling is a proper business, this is the attitude the government should assume towards it. It should stand on the same basis as the butcher shop and drug store. Another method is state control, or ownership. The South Carolina dispensary system is an illustration of this method. The sale of liquor by private persons was prohibited. State and county dispensaries were established. Profits were divided between State and local treasuries. "Local option, county control, or prohibition" are given as the methods of dealing with the saloon now in South Carolina. Some counties yet use the dispensary system. Of this method as a whole it may be said that it commits the State plainly and unreservedly to the liquor business. The government becomes the manager of it. The Gothenburg system, originating in Gothenburg, Sweden, is more or less of the same nature. A company was formed to conduct the liquor traffic under careful restrictions, and the net profits were to be paid into the city treasury. One result of this system is to give respectability to the drink business. License is a third method of dealing with this traffic. It proceeds upon the assumption that the saloon is not like an ordinary business, that it has dangerous features connected with it, that it needs regulation and restriction, and that it has no right to exist except under the direct permission and authorization of the government. A familiar form of license reads: "License is hereby given by authority of the city of B. to A. B. to keep a saloon and to sell," etc. Taxation and license are quite different. A tax can hardly be said to be an approval of a business, or to convey any authority for its continuance.

License is permission, authorization, protection, partnership.

License is of two kinds, high and low. Low license is the exaction of a moderate fee for the continuance of the business, while high license presumably recognizes more clearly the evils of the trade and is an endeavor by restriction to limit the business and its evil consequences. It dignifies the business. It is doubtful that it modifies its injurious nature; and it in no sense decreases governmental responsibility.



Local Option is still another method of dealing with the saloon question. Reference has already been made to it in another paragraph

Method of of this department.

Local Option Local option is not a temperance measure in itself. It may mean license as certainly as prohibition. It only can be claimed as a temperance measure from the fact that in the present state of public opinion, the country outside of our large cities is much more likely, when it has the opportunity, to vote against the saloon than for it. The enactment of a local option law by our legislature in Pennsylvania, much as we desire that it shall be done, in no legal sense commits our State to a policy of opposition to the saloon. It merely gives the people the chance to say whether they want it in their respective counties or not. The Governor, as we have before seen, asserts that the pending Williams Local Option bill is neither a wet nor dry measure. The North American of Philadelphia, which favors local option, in a recent editorial remarks: "If the local option bill should be passed—even if it should receive a unanimous vote in both the house of representa-

tives and the senate—it would not of itself increase or decrease by a single license the places where liquor is sold, nor directly affect the dispensing of liquors to the extent of one-half pint. The law would in no sense be automatic in its operation. It would embody no decree inflicting saloons upon communities which do not desire them, or removing saloons from communities which want them.” Again it asserts: “Further proof that this self-government demand is not a prohibition movement is found in the fact that many of the men who stand resolutely with Governor Brumbaugh for passage of the local option bill are frankly opposed to prohibition, and, when the matter comes to a vote in their counties, will be found casting their ballots for license.” And it also asserts that there are States in which the greater part of the territory is wet, which have yet had enough common sense, patriotism, and democracy, in their citizenship to adopt local option; that they have saloons, plenty of them, but they have them because the people have expressed their will to that end. Local option is not prohibition. It may not result in prohibition. It gives the saloon man as much an opportunity as the temperance man. The passage of a local option bill in Pennsylvania will make it more likely that Beaver County and Mercer County will go dry, but in Allegheny County, which contains the great city of Pittsburgh, segregation by this measure from the other parts of the State will probably leave the saloon more firmly entrenched. However, let us, in present circumstances, labor for the local option bill, as the best temperance movement in sight, for we know that it would result in the elimination of the

saloons from many counties in our commonwealth; and we will indulge the hope that such progress will help to lead to the complete suppression of the accused traffic in the Keystone State.



As we survey the different methods which the government might occupy towards the saloon, there is only one which commands full approval; and that is prohibition; prohibition by the State, or, better still, by the nation. It

**National
Prohibition
Essential**

alone stands the test. It alone relieves the government from responsibility. Our great nation, as a moral being, must be either for the saloon or against it. The citizen who votes under a local option law against the saloon is acting as a prohibitionist, but the government in granting this privilege of voting under such a law is in no sense taking a stand against the saloon. It is not, by granting such a law, relieving itself of responsibility. And our nation has already such a tremendous burden of guilt in connection with the liquor traffic that it is high time for it to manifest its repentance before the God of nations. Moreover, no legal measure but prohibition, and general prohibition, will meet the needs. License, yes, very high license, has been tried and has failed. The dispensary system has failed. Local treatment cannot cure a general disease; cannot cure it even in spots. A county line is not ten feet wide and a mile high. It is folly to put a dry county along side of a wet one.

Men do not need to drink strong drink. It does not need to be manufactured. It does not need to be sold. The government does not need to al-

low it to be sold. The government cannot authorize its sale, cannot permit its sale, without responsibility. What we need is national prohibition; nothing lower, nothing less will do. And we need also in the Constitution of our country such a recognition of divine authority and divine law as will provide a basis for the suppression of the liquor traffic and every kindred evil, and for the settlement of every moral question that arises in our national life.



Japan is apparently making a careful effort, during present disturbed international conditions, to secure a more or less dominating position in the control of the affairs of China.

Japan and China

"Japan is the one country which is to-day menacing the integrity and the open door of China," was the remark of Mr. P. S. Chang, a post graduate of Columbia, to a Gazette-Times reporter not long since in Pittsburgh. Mr. Chang had spoken on "The Relations of the United States and China." To the reporter he also said that the United States is the country on which China is chiefly relying to prevent any such encroachment; that Japan is giving his government fair promises, and constantly assuring his people that they have no thought of territorial aggression; but that it is significant that she is at the same time demanding control of certain sections of Chinese domain and seeking grants and concessions for investment purposes. Relations between these two countries have been somewhat strained by recent conditions. The Allied Powers and the United States have made certain representations to Japan concerning the situation. It

would be highly regrettable if China, which is making such progress, should come under the control of her smaller but at present more powerful neighbor. China should be allowed the opportunity for independent development, and it is to be hoped that the influence of Christianity will become more and more effective in moulding the sentiment, institutions, and government of this great people. Our nation has a peculiar interest in China, and it is our duty, if Japan seems determined to impose improper conditions upon her neighbor, to insist plainly on the protection of China's integrity and the open door. We have a special responsibility in the present hour, when the hands of certain nations in Europe are tied, for the welfare of this great nation, and may be able to do much.

Mr. Chang in his address at Pittsburgh said of the situation in general in China: "With the spread of Christianity our country is rapidly imbibing western civilization and culture, the younger generation being the leaders in this regeneration. To-day all of China is athirst for more knowledge of this religion, brought to them in the main by American missionaries. Great railroads now pierce China. Its merchants and manufacturers seem to have taken on a new life, and more energy is noted in every trade activity."

The real situation, according to a neighboring paper, is somewhat obscure. The possibility is expressed that the demands which have been made by Japan are less fundamental to Chinese autonomy than may appear "on the surface to an untrained interpreter of diplomatic correspondence." Count Okuma, the Japanese premier, has, according to this paper, telegraphed to the Independent "a message to

the American people." In his message under date of April 3, the Count says:

The uneasiness and suspicion in the United States in connection with Japan's negotiations at Peking are based on misunderstanding and misinformation scattered broadcast by interested mischief makers. When the negotiations are disclosed it will be found: that Japan has not infringed the rights of other nations; that Japan has adhered strictly to the principle of equal opportunity; that Japan is not attempting to secure a monopoly over China; that Japan is not attempting to create a protectorate over China; that Japan is not seeking to secure in China any advantage which does not accord with the Anglo-Japanese alliance or with any treaties or undertakings with the United States. We have fully informed the United States and other interested powers as to Japan's purposes. We believe that they are satisfied. The negotiations between Japan and China are nearing a satisfactory conclusion. I am now willing to state publicly through the Independent that Japan is quite confident of the rectitude and good faith of her position. Japan is merely seeking to settle outstanding troublesome questions in a way looking toward permanent peace and good understanding.

However a cable under date of April 13, from Peking makes the following statement:

Conferences between the representatives of China and Japan were resumed today, but the deadlock continued. The Chinese government declines to recede from its position, although the Japanese minister, Eki Hioki, threatened today to discontinue the negotiations. The Chinese Foreign Minister, Lu Cheng-Hsiang, refused to discuss Group V of the Japanese demands. This group relates to the employment of Japanese political, financial and military advisers and Japanese police, Japanese supervision of the manufacture or purchase of China's war munitions and rights for railway and mining operations. Hioki intimated that China

had favored Great Britain with railway concessions and had not given similar rights to Japan. He again urged China to grant the concessions demanded, and permit Japan to take up subsequently with Great Britain any question which might arise in respect of encroachment on British railway interests.



It is difficult to keep pace with the rapidly developing temperance situation. It appears, according to election returns of last month

Temperance from Michigan, that
Items temperance has won in thirteen out of sixteen

counties voting on local option, thereby adding nine counties to Michigan's dry area, and giving the State at least forty-three dry counties. This change forces at least 327 saloons out of business, and adds, it is said, 336,736 to the population of the State already in dry territory. Another significant item is the following:

The New York State Wholesale Liquor Dealers' Association, at its meeting last week, heard the following announcement leading the annual report: The events of the last twelve months have created a situation more grave than has ever before confronted our trade. Formerly we were called upon to oppose town and county option. To-day we must combat State and nation-wide prohibition. Originally our opponents were few and scattered. To-day they are many and united."

The Governor of Utah has vetoed the prohibition bill passed by the legislature of that State. Thus we have only eighteen States in the prohibition column, but the list may soon be increased. Much attention has been called to England's possible attitude to strong drink, but it looks as though she is not ready to make so brave a stand as Russia has done. Lloyd George has been in favor of prohibi-

tion, but the influence of the liquor men is strong. The following item from London appeared recently. We quote in part:

There will be no mandate issued putting a ban on intoxicants throughout Great Britain and the colonies during the duration of the war. Despite the fact that the government has the authority to enact a law declaring for nation-wide prohibition, no such action will be taken by the cabinet. On the contrary an appeal will be issued to the people to abstain from using hard drinks while the war is in progress. This will put the English people on its honor and will have more effect than would an edict compelling the people to stop

using intoxicants. This statement was made by a high official in the British government. He predicted that the people would follow the example of King George and other government leaders, and bar the use of intoxicants in their home, while the country was in the throes of the greatest war in its history. According to the Times several more cabinet meetings will be held, but the drink problem will be dealt with thusly: Total prohibition has been ruled out as impracticable. A prohibition on wines and spirits. Encouragement of lighter beers by compulsory reduction of their strength. Further restrictions in the sale of intoxicants in the military areas and in districts where munitions of war are being manufactured.

Editorials

THE EXPOSITION AND THE SABBATH

The facts with respect to the opening of the Panama exposition on the Lord's day have been presented in former issues of the Christian Statesman. The present purpose is to set forth briefly and pointedly certain reasons why the proposal should be resisted by all right thinking people throughout the land.

There are two conflicting views as to the nature, purpose and obligation of the weekly rest day. The conflict between these views is of long standing. It dates from the early Christian centuries. One view regards the Fourth Commandment as permanently binding and the first day of the week in this Christian dispensation as the Sabbath, the change of day having

been made by the authority of Christ and his inspired apostles. According to this view the Lord's day should be spent, not in secular labor or pleasure seeking, but in the public and private exercise of God's worship except so much as is to be taken up in works of necessity and mercy. The second view regards the Fourth Commandment as abrogated and holds that under this dispensation there is no Sabbath. The Lord's day is merely a substitute for the Sabbath, say the advocates of this theory. There is no divine authority back of it, and no authoritative rule directing us how to keep it. The advocates of this theory hold that while it is proper to spend at least part of the day in worship in honor of Christ's resurrection, it is also proper to spend other parts of it in worldly occupations, and even in worldly amusement and pleas-

ure seeking. This is the theory that has prevailed on the continent of Europe from a very early period, while the first is the theory of the people of Great Britain, Canada and the United States. The opening of the exposition on the Lord's day is the substitution of the erroneous continental theory for the true theory that has prevailed in this country since its foundation. It is dangerous thus to destroy the foundation of our social, religious and political institutions.

The opening of the exposition on the Lord's day is an invasion of the rights of the great mass of the American people who still hold to the correct view. We have the right to the preservation of the Sabbath as a great political institution. To run the exposition on any day of the week requires a vast number of laborers. When required to be on duty on the Lord's day their right to a day of rest is taken away. Moreover, the opening of such an exposition on the day of sacred rest is a national offense. It involves the whole body of the people in the sin unless they find an effective way to voice their protest and dissent. Probably there is no human law, State or National, that can be invoked, against this enormous national sin. The miserable excuse made by the managers that the Pacific coast theory of the Sabbath differs from that of the people farther east shows a very superficial conception of the nature and gravity of the situation. While this exposition is held on the Pacific Coast it does not belong exclusively to the people of that coast. It celebrates a national affair, and belongs to the people of the whole country. And the Fourth Commandment was not repealed when California

decided to abrogate its own Sabbath law some years ago. We therefore invoke the unrepealed and unrepealable law of God announced in thunder tones by the Almighty Himself against this act of national iniquity.

By opening the exposition on the Lord's day the managers of the exposition are violating their own word of honor. They gave the guarantee to some of the prospective exhibitors that the exposition would be closed on that day. But now, without any change in the circumstances warranting a change of policy, they deliberately violate their own solemn pledge and announce that "the lid is off" and that throughout the entire season the exposition will be open with added attractions on the Lord's day. Surely if men expect the confidence of their fellows they should have a higher regard for their own word.

Finally, San Francisco should not so soon forget the earthquake and the fire. Such calamities do not come without a cause and a purpose. There is a God who takes notice of the deeds of men and of nations. He controls the forces of nature and uses them for the accomplishment of his purposes. "Praise Jehovah from the earth. . . . Fire and hail, snow and vapor; stormy wind, fulfilling his word." When a people fear God all these forces are at peace with them. But the stars in their courses fight against the people who are rebellious against the Lord of hosts. Let the exposition be closed on the Lord's day as an act of obedience to the divine commandment, as a right belonging to the whole American people, as an act of faithfulness to the pledge made by the managers, and as an act of public righteousness to avert the judgments of God.

FALSE VIEWS OF THE AMERICAN GOVERNMENT.

In the prosecution of the work of political reform there are encountered a great variety of views concerning the origin, character and purpose of civil government in general, and of the government of the United States in particular. The attitude of different classes of citizens toward any specific political reform depends largely on their governmental theories. For example, objections to the adoption of an amendment to the national constitution acknowledging divine authority and divine law grow out of the conception that such an acknowledgment would be inconsistent with the character and aim of the American nation. The popular form of the objection runs as follows: The founders of this republic came to these shores to escape the tyranny of the old world despotisms and to found a government where the refugees of all nations may find freedom to believe and practice their various religious creeds without molestation by the political authorities. Jews, Mohammedans, even atheists, as well as the various Christian sects may here find a safe refuge from the storms of persecution. All may here sit down at the same political council table, and all alike enjoy the blessings of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness under the protecting aegis of the national constitution. No one of these differing classes may mould the constitution in conformity with their peculiar religious or non-religious beliefs. All have the same right to give to the frame of government a religious bias, which is practically no right at all. The process of reaching a solution of the problem of religion in the political sphere is merely

a problem in cancellation. The terms are all equal and there are as many on one side as on the other, and so they cancel one another. The answer, which is 0, is easily obtained.

It is quite manifest that this method of handling the problem makes havoc, not only of all proposed moral reforms in the political sphere, but also of all existing Christian features of our country. It would result in turning the country over bodily to the atheists. But this is contrary to the fundamental proposition itself, which is that no class of believers or unbelievers may impress their theories on the framework of government. By what right therefore may the atheist have things all his own way? A theory which runs into such an inconsistency at the very beginning of the effort to put it into operation must be faulty. It is false, pernicious, and exceedingly dangerous.

One of the deceptive features of this and all such views is that it starts with a true proposition, and then distorts it so as to use it in the support of heresy. All that the advocates of such views say about the founders of this government coming to these shores in search of freedom and making this land an asylum for the oppressed of all nations is true. But it is at this very point that their truthful assertions come to a sudden stop. If those founders themselves are to be believed they had no thought of framing a government devoid of all religious complexion. They specifically declare that they came for the purpose of founding Christian governments and to promote the interests of the kingdom of Jesus Christ. This statement can be verified by any one who cares to take the time and trouble to look up the Colonial Charters. Moreover, in their compacts of gov-

ernment they give specific proof of the fact that their idea of an asylum for the oppressed of all nations was very different from the idea of those who now claim in the name of secular civil government to be their exponents and defenders. It never occurred to the Fathers of this country that it would be possible to lay the foundations and to rear the superstructure of a great free government without laying the cornerstone on religious belief. In many of the great orations of Daniel Webster and other statesmen of a bygone generation these ideas were eloquently and powerfully presented.

But the assertion is made that while all this may be true it merely shows that those men were not consistent; they started out well, but they had not thought their system of government through to the end; they had not yet learned how to construct a government logically consistent throughout with the fundamental principles of liberty; but that this was done by the later fathers who framed the national constitution. It is held therefore that to impose upon that instrument an acknowledgment of God, of Christ and of the Bible would be a backward step, and should be resisted.

This again is both false, pernicious and exceedingly dangerous. It is not our present purpose to set forth the reasons that led to the omission of all religious acknowledgments from the national constitution. What we propose to do is to show that such omission is not required by the genius of the American Republic, that it is in direct conflict with the most fundamental principles of civil government and that it will, if consistently carried out, defeat the great aim of the founders of this government when they dedicated it to

freedom for the oppressed of all nations.

First of all, what does the genius of this republic require in the matter of religious acknowledgments? How is this matter to be determined? By the one solitary example of an organic law destitute of such acknowledgment or by the more than fifty examples of such acknowledgments? Which gives us the better and truer illustration of the genius of this republic: the national constitution without an acknowledgment of God, or the Charters, Colonial Compacts, the Declaration of Independence, the Articles of Confederation, the Great Law of 1787, and our present forty-eight State constitutions with such acknowledgments? The omission of all religious acknowledgment from our national constitution therefore instead of following logically from the principles already established and embedded in the foundation of the government was in direct hostility to those principles. Logical consistency demanded that this recognition be made when the constitution was framed; and since it was not done then it should be done now. If this is not so why and how did it happen that all our State constitutions have placed themselves in line with the old custom of acknowledging God instead of lining up with the national constitution in omitting such acknowledgment?

Our next aim is to show that such omission is hostile to the most fundamental principles of civil government. It is understood that the persons with whom we are having this present contention are Christian in their belief. They therefore will admit the proof furnished by the Scriptures on the origin, moral character and accountability of civil government. The writer

once had a discussion with a Christian minister who admitted every one of the fundamental principles of civil government as advocated by the National Reform Association, but who opposed the embodying of them in the national constitution for fear of disastrous consequences. In the next paragraph we will deal with the idea of disastrous consequences. What now concerns us is the logic of the principles themselves. These principles, namely, that civil government is an ordinance of God deriving its authority from Him, that the Lord Jesus Christ is the Ruler of nations, that the divine will is supreme over nations and governments, are clearly established from the Word of God, and we will not now repeat the argument. The class of people whom we are trying to reach will admit the truth of each one of them. Now these things being true, what is their practical value? What use are we to make of them? They certainly must be given some place in human affairs, so that their value may be realized. Is it enough to state them in Church creeds? to preach them occasionally from the pulpit? These things should be done. But these are political principles, not ecclesiastical. True they are religious and should receive the sanction of the Church and be presented in the pulpit. But where should they be put into practice? Evidently in the political realm and by the government itself, as well as by individual citizens.

Now let us see about the disastrous consequences that might follow. This outcry is raised only by those whose vision is distorted, and who fail to see the difference between the proposition to have the nation declare its own relation to God and to act according to his will and the proposition to employ

some church as a sort of intermediary between God and the nation and which may seek to employ the civil power to enforce discipline. In seeking to avoid the dangers of Scylla we should not risk Charybdis. By swinging too far from union of Church and State, the danger is that the government is made to assume an atheistic character, which is even worse than the other evil. Such great thinkers as Professor Taylor Lewis have shown by irresistible logic that neutrality is impossible in this matter of national religion. Opponents of the Christian amendment proceed on the fallacious theory that nations can manufacture their own principles in this matter, and can therefore construct a government in which religion is so treated as to place the government on neutral ground. But since there are principles of national religion set forth in the Scriptures, it is impossible to be neutral concerning them. He that is not with Christ is against him. So is it with the nation. National stability depends on religion. So far is a non-religious government from being an asylum for the oppressed that such a government can have no existence at all, or if it has it would be the most precarious kind of a safeguard for any human interest. In fact it would be a house built on the sand which is doomed to sure destruction.



LIBERTY, CIVIL AND PERSONAL

In the bygone generations, and especially during the period when the people of this country were struggling for national independence, the term "civil liberty" was the one by which they sought to set forth in a single expression the great end for which they struggled. This too is the term em-

ployed by the great writers such as Professor Francis Lieber, at one time professor of Political Science in the University of South Carolina, and afterwards professor in the same department in Columbia University in the city of New York. Sometimes the term "religious liberty" was coupled with it, and both together were designed to set forth the thought that all men are entitled to that full measure of freedom to think and to act which is consistent with the political and religious welfare of the country.

Today, instead of civil liberty, we hear much about "personal liberty." There are "personal liberty" societies, composed of citizens of foreign birth who are bent upon the destruction of many of the safeguards whereby civil liberty is protected. Personal liberty is the cry raised in opposition to restrictive and prohibitory laws relating to the liquor traffic. In the recent local option hearing before a committee of the Pennsylvania legislature, the "personal liberty" advocates were there in great force to argue against the proposed local option law. Personal liberty is the cry raised against all legislation to restrain public Sabbath desecration. By this sign the foes of the Sabbath have succeeded in nullifying such laws in many of the States in the Union.

The same cry is raised in opposition to the Bible in the public schools. It is declared to be an invasion of personal liberty to require the reading of the Bible or to allow any religious exercise in connection with our public school system.

The classes of citizens who thus reason and who thus seek to overthrow some of our most cherished institutions, usages and customs are the Jews, cer-

tain German societies, and some who are American born but who have fallen from that high moral and religious estate occupied by their ancestors. What makes the situation so very critical is the fact that many Christian citizens have assumed a position of ease and indifference concerning the whole matter, or have even adopted the theory that since our population is composed of all classes and shades of belief and unbelief we must simply yield and allow the unreligious and the anti-religious classes to determine the character and policy of our government. It is even said by some that Christian people have no right to impose upon the government any principle or policy to which our non-Christian citizens take exception. They practically assume the position of the "personal liberty" advocates and join in the cry that such customs, usages and laws invade the rights of these citizens.

Properly defined personal liberty is something greatly to be desired. There is a liberty to think, to believe, to act, which no government has the right to circumscribe or take away. But when personal liberty is made the slogan of a movement to overthrow the wholesome restraints of law the result almost certainly is that the personal liberty of the aggressive class invades the personal liberty of another class. And what is still more dangerous to the welfare of society the civil liberty of the nation itself is likely to be overthrown. There can be no liberty worthy the name apart from the restraints of law. The human family has not reached that stage of progress where self-government can wholly supercede civil government. Personal liberty regulated

wholly by self-government is the annihilation of true liberty.

A few examples will serve to illustrate and enforce this statement. Personal liberty is the plea urged against those Sabbath laws whereby restraint is placed upon unnecessary labor and worldly amusements on the Lord's Day. But when these restraints are removed the liberty to worship in quietness on the part of great numbers of people is destroyed. The liberty to rest one day in seven is taken away from all who are required to carry on work on the Sabbath in mills, factories and so forth, or to minister to pleasure seekers.

Personal liberty is urged in opposition to laws designed to limit or prohibit the traffic in strong drink. But the saloon is the most dangerous kind of a menace to the liberty of our citizenship. It lays a heavy burden of taxes upon the people of every State where it is tolerated; it takes a heavy toll in the destruction of life; it invades the realm of the soul itself and destroys reverence for God and consigns its victims to endless torment.

Personal liberty is the plea urged in opposition to the Bible in the public schools. To read this book and to draw lessons from it for the purpose of training our young people for citizenship is declared to be an invasion of the rights of those who do not believe it. But the shallowness of this plea ought to be apparent to every one whose thinking faculties are not sadly out of repair. No attempt is made where the Bible is used to compel any one to believe it. In most cases those who are opposed to the custom can absent themselves from the school room while the Bible is being read.

No penalty or disadvantage is incurred for such absence. But when, notwithstanding this, the Bible is excluded from our schools, the rights of those who want it there are invaded. They believe in that book as the standard of morals in the school, on the playground, and everywhere else. They believe that it is not merely a church book, but a political book as well, and that the training of citizens can not be carried on successfully unless it is used for the development of moral character. Evidently a most fearful error is committed and most dangerous consequences follow when personal liberty, considered apart from civil liberty, and apart from the moral standard of the Christian religion, is made the slogan in the carrying forward of the work of political change.

To escape from the strife of pens and tongues about personal liberty it is wise to raise the question about civil liberty and to seek to discover its nature, grounds and bounds. Civil liberty signifies first of all the liberty of the civil or political body itself. Then it involves the idea of the liberty of each citizen as determined and regulated by the principles of civil liberty. In its whole realm liberty is to be determined by the principles of the moral law. Neither the state nor the individual can claim liberty to be immoral. The moral law sets the boundaries of liberty. Within those boundaries the state has sovereign authority to act in all matters belonging to the political realm as defined by the Bible principles of civil government. Personal liberty is to be enjoyed within the limitations thus determined.

THE MORMON HIERARCHY

Of all the institutions, whether ancient or modern, challenging investigation by students of Social Science, Mormonism presents the most annoying and baffling features. This is so because of the unwillingness of the leaders to let the world know some of the most essential facts, because the published documents are not a full exposition of the beliefs, practices and purposes of the institution, and because of the facility with which the charge is made by the hierarchs of misrepresentation and erroneous interpretation of the attitude of this institution by those who seek to give to the public a fair statement as to its real nature.

Of the multitudes of Mormon missionaries who travel over the world seeking to make converts, and who creep into houses and lead captive both silly men and silly women, perhaps there are very few who are fully instructed as to the whole Mormon system in its principles and aims, or, being instructed, will declare the whole counsel of the Mormon hierarchy. Even when placed on oath there is positive evidence that the whole truth cannot be elicited, as is abundantly shown by the report of the very extensive hearing in the case of Reed Smoot.

It is no wonder therefore that the great mass of the American people are quite benighted as to the real character of the Mormon system. Many have been beguiled by the well-told stories of the Mormon representatives and the assurances given out by politicians who are dependent upon the Mormon vote for their official positions. There are many well-meaning Christian citizens who think that it is a waste of time and energy to carry on a campaign against

Mormonism. They think that there is nothing more to fear from the Mormons than from any other "church." If Mormonism was only a church in any true sense of the term the fears many of us entertain would doubtless be groundless. But that state of mind which is able to look with calmness upon Mormonism and to regard the anti-Mormon crusade as a Quixotic enterprise is the same as that which will allow one to sleep calmly on the brink of a precipice, or under the very shadow of Vesuvius when there are unmistakable signs of an eruption. The chief difficulty with the average good American citizen is to get him to sit still long enough to listen to the facts. He means well, but he is too credulous as to the good intentions of those who are seeking to gain control of the government and convert it into a Mormon kingdom.

There is some difficulty even in getting an appropriate descriptive title for the institution of Mormonism. It is popularly known as a Church, and as all churches have equal rights before the law, it is common for people to class Mormonism along with the rest and to consider it as one of the multitudinous sects that enjoy protection under our political system. But while Mormons are perfectly willing that this sort of delusion shall continue so long as it affords them surcease from annoyance on the part of Gentiles, this is certainly not their own view of themselves. They claim to belong in a class by themselves and deny that they are merely one of the Christian sects. This itself is ominous, and should arouse the suspicions of all citizens who have a desire for the welfare of their country. The very form, claim and

design of the Mormon system puts it in a class in which it stands alone.

There is difficulty in determining what volumes may be quoted as setting forth authoritatively the distinctive views of Mormonism. In the case of all other institutions, whether of churches, nations, or even of secret orders, there is not much difficulty in fixing upon the standard authorities by whose utterances a fair judgment may be formed. The creeds of churches and the utterances of representative men will give a fair presentation of their doctrines, characteristics and aims. The constitutions, laws and other official utterances by representative men will do the same for the various nations and governments of the world. We even have access to all that is necessary to enable us to form an independent, comprehensive, fair opinion about secret orders both ancient and modern. But when we come to the task of making a thorough scientific study of Mormonism we are confronted by a difficulty that has no existence any other where. In the Senatorial hearing in the Smoot case, Mormon witnesses denied that utterances by representative Mormons could be taken as giving an authoritative exposition of the system. It was held that nothing may be quoted as exponents of Mormonism except the documents which have been officially adopted, which are the Bible, the Book of Mormon, the Doctrine and Covenants, and the Pearl of Great Price. But these works do not tell the whole story. They leave much to be supplied from other sources, such as the writings and public discourses of such men as Parley Pratt, Brigham Young, Brigham H. Roberts and others. Unless this is done there is danger of being deceived. And this is in part the

explanation of the attitude of indifference assumed by a host of simple minded American citizens.

But for the purpose now in hand it is not necessary for us to travel outside these official documents. In fact the book of Doctrines and Covenants itself will be sufficient for our present purpose. All we wish to do at present is to show that Mormonism is controlled by the most cunningly devised hierarchical system ever set in operation by designing men. The book entitled "The Doctrine and Covenants of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints," makes the claim that it contains "revelations given to Joseph Smith Junior, the prophet, for the building up of the Kingdom of God in the last days." Section 107 contains all that we desire now to make use of. It presents the form of organization under which Mormonism is governed. The principal points in this form are here presented for the careful study of thoughtful people.

The government of Mormonism is a most elaborately wrought out hierarchy, 'the officials being disposed organically in ranks and orders each subordinate to the one above it,' Official authority is vested in two orders of priesthood, namely the Order of Melchisedek and the Order of Aaron. But the order of Aaron is subordinate to that of Melchisedek. Beginning with the lowest rank of Mormon officials, there is a gradual rise step by step till the highest is reached, which is the First Presidency. The principal officials in this hierarchical system are the following: First, the Deacon, whose duties are mainly of a temporal nature, pertaining to the care of houses of worship. But deacons may be called

to the assistance of the next higher officers. Second, the Teacher. These officials are to mingle freely with the people and to teach them their obligations as members of the true church. Both deacons and teachers may preach. Third, Priests. Their principal duty is to preach and to ordain deacons and teachers. Fourth, Elders. They may officiate in all the lower callings of the priesthood. In addition they may ordain elders, confirm applicants for membership and confer the Holy Ghost. Fifth, Seventies. They are preeminently travelling ministers, ordained to carry the gospel to all nations, to the Gentiles first and also to the Jews. They act under the direct supervision of the Apostles, to be mentioned later. Sixth, High Priests. They are to officiate in all the ordinances and blessings of the church. They may also travel as missionaries the same as the seventies. Seventh, Patriarchs or Evangelists. There should be a patriarch in each of the large branches of the church, but there is one patriarch who is supreme over the whole church, who holds the power of keys. Unto him the promise is given that "whosoever he blesses shall be blessed, and whosoever he curses shall be cursed, that whatsoever he shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever he shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." Eighth, Apostles. They are called to be special witnesses of the name of Christ to the world, but their work lies mainly within the church itself, to organize, build up, and regulate the affairs of the church wherever they may go. Ninth, The First Presidency. The president is chosen from among the members of the High Priesthood to preside over the entire church. He is known as the

President of the High Priesthood of the Church, or, Presiding High Priest over the High Priesthood of the Church. "He is called to be a seer, a revelator, a translator, and a prophet, having all the gifts of God which he bestows upon the head of the Church. His station is compared by the Lord to that of Moses of old, who so stood as the mouth-piece of God unto Israel. In his exalted labors among the Church, this presiding High Priest is assisted by two others holding the same Priesthood, and these three High Priests, when properly appointed and ordained, and upheld by the confidence, faith and prayers of the Church, 'form a quorum of the Presidency of the Church.'" To complete the statement as to the organization of the hierarchy it may be added that a quorum of deacons consists of twelve; a quorum of teachers, twenty-four; a quorum of priests, forty-eight; a quorum of elders, ninety-six; a quorum of seventies, seventy.

Here then is the system beginning with the deacon and culminating with the vicegerent of God who stands in the same relation to men today as Moses did in bygone ages. There are a few things that should be said that make clear the fact that such a system is fraught with grave danger to the American Republic. The system itself is thoroughly despotic. A despotism in the heart of this republic trains its subjects in anti-republican principles. Even if the government of Mormonism should confine its activity to its own ecclesiastical realm the influence of the system will be felt in the civil sphere. But when it is remembered that obedience to the superior authorities is a saving grace in Mormonism, it is plain to be seen what a temptation exists to

wield the Mormon power in behalf of Mormon interests in the political sphere. The history of Mormonism shows plainly that this has been done in the past, and in like circumstances will be done again.

It is clear to any thoughtful mind that in the discussion thus far we have only touched the outside edges of the Mormon system. It is not claimed that our civil government has any right to interfere with the Mormon system

either as to its form of government, its system of doctrine or its manner of life and worship, viewed simply as a religious system. As we pursue our investigation farther it will become evident that Mormonism is not merely a religious system or an ecclesiastical institution. It is vastly more and other than this. What it is besides is at least vaguely suggested by what has already been said. But the fuller discussion is reserved for another time.

Special Articles

THE MORMON KING "REPORTS"

James S. Martin

The Mormon church was organized in Fayette, Seneca County, New York, April 6, 1830, a little more than 85 years ago. During the whole period which intervenes, nearly a century, with the exception of a very short time in the early history of the church, the law of tithes and consecrations has been in operation. That law has been previously explicated in the pages of the Christian Statesman. Briefly, it is a pretended revelation from God requiring every member of the church to pay to the Prophet ten per cent of all annual income; and to hold all property as a consecration to the requirements of the Prophet whenever he shall make demand. No one outside of the Mormon church can form any conception of the fabulous sums which have thus been rendered to the Prophet's purpose. It is also quite probable that no one within the Mormon church could now give that total; because the records have been purposely or care-

lessly confused and many of the gifts or consecrations exacted by the Prophet have been directed from the contributor immediately to the object of the assumed consecration without any accounting in the usual financial books of the church. That the aggregate rises into hundreds of millions of dollars will not be doubted by any one who has given study to the subject.

On April 4th last, the annual conference of the Mormon church convened in the great tabernacle in Salt Lake City. According to Associated Press dispatches coming from the capital of the Mormon kingdom "The first public financial statement ever issued by the Mormon church was presented" on that day. "The report shows that the church collected \$1,887,920 from tithes in 1914."

Let us consider four important propositions separately. (1) What has been the occasion of the secrecy maintained by the Mormons through nearly a century of time? (2) Why does the Prophet now make a public statement? (3) Is the amount of the tithes cor-

rectly stated? (4) What was the revenue from commercial investments?

1. It has been the policy of all the rulers of Mormondom to deny to their followers any right to inquire concerning the tithes. From the beginning the assumption has been that the tithes and consecrations belong to the Prophet as the sole representative of the Almighty on this earth; that his use of them was one of the sacred mysteries of the kingdom; and that it was rank apostasy for anyone to make inquiry. In so far as the civil institution could endorse this outrageous proposition, the Prophet's claim has received protection and support within the kingdom. Men were excommunicated from the church for asking what became of the tithes. Men were excommunicated from the church for beginning proceedings in the civil courts to procure an accounting. This concealment grew into the rigid system of Mormon finance. And under its cover the Prophet was enabled to appropriate the funds, to any use or misuse, according to his pleasure, without any accountability to the mass of contributors or to the civil institutions. Secrecy has been the very keystone of this arch. A regular public report of the tithe receipts to the conference of the church might lessen the inflow of the tithes and a regular report of the expenditures of investments might arouse rebellion. It is a demonstration of the effectiveness of Mormon discipline and the growth of an idea in a community that, in the 85 years, the Mormon mass has gradually settled down into a general conviction of the propriety and the need of the Prophet's outrageous course. The Mormons now are in the fourth generation of tithe payers; and as they have been tutored to pay so they have been

tutored to submit without question. It is a tradition in the Mormon kingdom that Brigham Young, upon one occasion when his own accounts were somewhat short and the church revenues somewhat plethoric, appropriated to himself nearly a million dollars for services rendered. It may be that the tradition is true; it may be false. But the significance lies in the fact that the Mormons believe it and yet have never remonstrated. The Mormon Prophet has appropriated the tithes at his pleasure to finance his extensive commercial monopolies; and until now he has never made even a pretended accounting. There has been no effective remonstrance. As valuable therefore as the bulk of the tithes has been the secrecy concerning the amount and the expenditure.

2. It is a common expression within Mormondom that all reforms, real or pretended, have come as a result of outside pressure. No reform has ever originated within the Mormon church. The present accounting or pretended accounting of tithe receipts is an illustration. What the plea of the faithful through the years, what the demand through the civil courts could not accomplish has been achieved—in appearance at least—by the national Crusade against the crimes and treasons of Mormonism. Last year twenty thousand memorials were poured into Washington to the various departments of government asking that the Mormon kingdom be brought into subjection to the civil government. Among the demands has been an explicit one for an accounting of the Mormon property trusteeship and a dissolution of its monopolistic advances as a combination in restraint of trade. The Mormon hierarchs are taking alarm,

and they are seeking to mitigate public judgment by offering an assumed account of their tithe revenues. The Prophet himself presented his financial statement to his conference. According to the report in the Mormon church organ, *The Deseret News*: "President Smith said there had been so many false reports circulated by enemies concerning the tithes of the Church that he had decided to depart from the usual course and to give a brief accounting of what had been done with the tithing paid in 1914." What the constant rights and the occasional demands of Mormon tithe payers for eighty-five years have been unable to achieve, has at last been accomplished by the external pressure of this Crusade; again demonstrating the fact that all reforms of the Mormon institution are enforced from without. None originate from within.

3. There is no evidence whatever that the statement of tithe receipts is correct. The course of diplomacy pursued by the Mormon Prophet in all his public relations is, on the contrary, a strong indication that the figures he now offers as a financial statement are totally at variance with the facts. We have but to consider what effect the Prophet would desire to create by the figures of his report, and then we may be assured that the figures will conform to his idea of the means necessary to produce that effect. Just now the Prophet is desirous of modifying the ideas of the public concerning the magnitude of his revenues and his holdings. As the entire accounting system is under the direction of the Prophet; as no one has access to the books except the auditing committee appointed from among the Prophet's favorites; his misrepresenta-

tion of facts would be, for the time, quite safe. And he might here have a pretended ground upon which to stand: The tithing books close for a calendar year at any date to be fixed by the Prophet. For 1914, if he had anticipated an intention to make a public report, he could close the books on the 31st day of December and instruct his heaviest tithe payers to hold back their contributions until sometime in January. This is only one of innumerable ways in which the Prophet could jockey with his accounts. There is ample reason to believe that the tithes of the Mormon church are more nearly four million dollars per annum than two million dollars. It has been a well authenticated rumor in the Mormon kingdom that the annual tithe contributions had reached \$2,600,000 by the year 1896. It took some time for this fact, if it be a fact, to percolate through the channels of the priesthood into general public consciousness. Probably the whisper which went through the Mormon kingdom was true. Also it is probable that the tithes were then increasing and have since increased at the rate of 10 per cent per annum—each year showing an increase of one-tenth over the preceding year. So far as we know there is no way of ascertaining the tithes of 1914 at present, unless we accept the statement made by the Prophet to his general conference April 4. And as we have shown, this is a most improbable report produced by the Prophet for certain purposes and with little likelihood that it conformed to the facts or was intended to conform to the facts. The Prophet himself has shown great facility in falsifying. He has also shown absolute shamelessness when confronted by his falsehood. After his return from his

appearance as a witness before the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections he practically acknowledged in his tabernacle that he had made misstatements and he said naively that he had so conducted himself in order to "escape a trap set by his enemies." In view of his disposition to misstate and his reason for misstating in this tithe case, it is a reasonable assumption that the Mormon Prophet is giving a false report of his tithe receipts.

4. After all the important point is left out of the pretended report. There is no statement of receipts from commercial investments, nor is there a statement of the disbursements thereof. It has long been known that by far the larger income of the Mormon Prophet is derived from his interest in corporations, an interest which he holds for his Kingdom or for himself or for either at his pleasure. These investments began soon after congress mercifully restored the formerly escheated property of the Mormon Kingdom. The estate returned to the Mormon Prophet in trust for his people, with its accretions, has grown into a stupendous pile of wealth. Concerning this the Prophet makes no statement to his people. According to the Deseret News, the sole information afforded on this point is as follows: "The expenses of the general Church authorities and the maintenance of the office of the First Presidency is derived from investments of Church funds and not out of the tithes." Unintentionally the Prophet confirms the charges made against his financial tyrannies and his felonious misappropriations of the trust funds restored by congress for the benefit of his people. Prophet Smith now declares that these investments supply the expenses of the general church authorities, meaning

himself and his favorites. He makes no further report. His own language is a more cutting indictment than any-one else has ever brought against him.

However, there is hope. The pressure which this Crusade is bringing to bear upon the Mormon kingdom has shown several victories. The Mormon church defends itself upon the floors of the United States Senate, showing that it fears the effect of public opinion through the Crusade. The Prophet does not now travel about the country with his harem, as flagrantly as he traveled before this Crusade began. The Mormon Prophet is making an accounting, or pretended accounting, of the volume of tithes. Even so much of progress, as is herein accounted, ought to be an encouragement to the Christian patriots of the land to continue the public pressure.



THE CHRISTIAN SABBATH

Mrs. M. F. Russell

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." "If thou restrain thy foot for the sake of the Sabbath from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord honorable and shalt honor him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it." Exod. 20:8-11; Isa. 58:13, 14.

The above command and promise were addressed directly to God's ancient covenant people, Israel. It is but a reasonable inquiry therefore,

whether the command has any binding authority upon us as Christians, or its promise any inspiring hope for us. Some think not, and claim that Israel's Sabbath day was designed merely as a type of the Christian's every-day rest of faith or continual Sabbath; and that while Christians may, from force of habit or custom or preference, observe the day as one of rest from toil, there is to them no divine command to this effect. Still others, while they recognize the command, feel that they are, to a large extent, released from its obligations, and do not clearly discern either its present privileges or the import of its promise; while many are in doubt as to whether the seventh or the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath; and if the change from the Jewish seventh to the Christian first day has been duly authorized, upon what Bible authority the change rests. **These and related thoughts** show the importance of a present careful consideration of the claims of the Christian Sabbath.

It is clear, we believe, that the command to keep the Sabbath holy is as binding upon Christians as it was upon Israel, and therefore that the above exhortation and promise are fully as significant and fraught with blessing to us as to them. Though the command was directly addressed to them, as was the entire law of God, that was not the first institution of the Sabbath; nor was the giving of the law at Mount Sinai the first institution of the divine law; for its principles of supreme love and loyalty to God and love to the neighbor as to self were first inscribed, not upon tablets of stone, but upon the fleshly tablet of the human heart in its original perfection, and the penalty of its violation was clearly foretold.

The first institution of the Sabbath is mentioned in Gen. 2:2, 3. "And on the seventh day God had finished his work which he had made, and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it (separated, set it apart from the other days, hallowed it) **because** that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." Thus the Sabbath was instituted in the very dawn of human existence, before sin had yet defiled the earth. It was ordained as a memorial of God's finished work of creation and its presentation to his newly created human children.

It was to be kept "holy," sacred, as a day devoted to the worship and praise of God, to thoughts of his goodness and greatness, and of his loving kindness to men, and his just claims upon them of responsive love, and of loyalty and obedience to his righteous and wise authority. And the day so kept had the special blessing of God upon it: "God blessed the day and hallowed it." How? How else could he signally bless and hallow this day above the other days of the week than, as he subsequently indicated to Israel that he would, bless it if the Israelites would obediently keep it holy? viz., by allowing them upon that day, **specially**, to find delight in communion and fellowship with him both individually and collectively. So it was to be a day of joy and rejoicing in the Lord, of communion and fellowship with him, of marked manifestations of divine favor, a blessed day of family reunion and spiritual feasting at the heavenly Father's table.

The appointment of this occasion for the special and mutual communion and fellowship of the Creator and the

creature was the natural expression of a loving Father's heart; and it was doubtless originally observed by his sinless children with responsive filial affection and fervent piety. Its recurrence every seventh day called our first parents to grateful worship and praise of the Giver of every good and perfect gift: for the earth and the fulness thereof, for Paradise with all its beauty and bounty, for the smiling heavens and the benedictions of the distant works of God as daily and nightly they performed their appointed ministries, for the glorious image of God in their then perfect humanity, for the delightful communion and fellowship with God himself, and for the good hope of eternal life in the enjoyment of the continual favor of God which they never expected to forfeit.

Though the hymns of that primitive worship in the temple of Paradise have not been borne to our ears, yet we can almost catch the strains of that melody as the beautiful scene of the tranquility and joy of those early Sabbaths passes before our mental vision. It was a day when the pruning and dressing of the garden and the ordering of Eden's bowers was abandoned and the results of the six days' labor were enjoyed, and when God himself drew specially near to his children while they drew near to him.

This was the real spirit of the institution, and in no other spirit can it at any time be observed acceptably to God. God created man for his own pleasure: "Thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are, and were created." (Rev. 4:11.) And man can never find real happiness except in conscious harmony and fellowship with his Creator. As a Father God takes a benevolent delight in his children, and

therefore while during six days he would have them "diligent in business serving the Lord," honoring him with their substance and by the integrity and moral excellence of their lives, giving time and thought and energy to their several avocations, yet, at the appointed Sabbath days, he would have them drop all these pursuits and release their thoughts and energies from them to draw near to him and to each other in heavenly communion, that the bond of loving fellowship and mutual sympathy might strengthen more and more, and yield the precious fruits of holy joy and heavenly peace.

It was the entrance of sin that marred, and by and by obliterated, the Edenic Sabbath. Amidst the ravages of sin few were the faithful souls who continued to remember God and delighted to do his will, to return thanks for all his benefits and to hope in his promises. These few, such as Abel, Enoch and Noah, were probably all that continued to remember and observe the Sabbath, for they walked with God, and had the testimony that they pleased God. Heb. 11:5.

But by and by, after long centuries of ungodliness had obliterated almost every thought of God, and God had long left his ungrateful creatures to their own devices, yet having special care over the few who respected and honored him, in great mercy, when he chose the seed of Abraham, his "friend," to be his peculiar people, and covenanted to be a Father unto them, one of the first things he did for that people, after striking off the fetters of their bondage, was to reestablish with them the blessing of the Sabbath, as a sign of his covenant favor—that thenceforth they should be treated as the family of God with those privileges

of communion and fellowship with him which the Sabbath thus given insured.

This important provision even preceded the giving of the law at Mount Sinai, of which law it also formed a part. *Exod. 16:23-30.* "And Moses said unto them: This is that which the Lord hath said, Tomorrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord: bake that which ye will bake, and seethe that which ye will seethe; and that which remaineth over lay up for you to be kept until the morning. And they laid it up till the morning as Moses bade, and it did not stink, neither was there any worm therein. And Moses said, Eat that to-day, for to-day is a Sabbath unto the Lord: to-day ye shall not find it in the field. Six days ye shall gather it, but on the seventh which is the Sabbath, in it there shall be none.

. . . The Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days: abide ye every man in his place; let no man go out of his place on the seventh day. So the people rested on the seventh day."

When this commandment appeared in the divine law, so grandly and solemnly promulgated, first spoken by the Lord to assembled Israel out of the midst of the fire and cloud and thick darkness that enveloped Mount Sinai, and subsequently "written with the finger of God" on tables of stone and delivered unto Moses (*Deut. 5:22; Exod. 31:18*), it is noticeable that it is not presented as a new institution, but as an old institution revived. Mark the words—"Remember the Sabbath day, etc." "The seventh day is the Sabbath."

Then reference is made to the time and the reason of its first institution, immediately following the work of

creation: "**For** in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: **wherefore** the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it." It had been blessed and hallowed centuries previous to this, but it had fallen into disuse, had been ignored and forgotten, and now it was being reinstated among the people whom the Lord had chosen to be his people. See also *Nehemiah 9:13, 14.* "Thou camest down also upon Mount Sinai and spakest with them from heaven and **madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath.**"

The observance of the Sabbath therefore was not to be regarded as an irksome obligation upon Israel, but as a blessed privilege, and a sign to them of their covenant relationship and favor with God; and it was so regarded by those who entered into the spirit of it.

"And the Lord said unto Moses, Speak thou also unto the children of Israel saying, Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations, that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you. . . Six days may work be done; but on the seventh is the Sabbath of rest holy to the Lord. . . . Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath throughout their generations **for a perpetual covenant.** It is a sign between me and the children of Israel forever; for in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." (*Exod. 31:12-17*). Thus this memorial of creation, this day of holy joy, was to Israel a sign of God's covenant favor to them, as its first ap-

pointment had been to Adam and Eve in Eden.

If God thus instituted the Sabbath in sinless Eden and subsequently with great solemnity reinstated it in Israel when he adopted that nation as his people, and for the very same stated reasons, viz., as a memorial of his creative work and a sign of his covenant favor, upon what principle can the people of God of this age ignore or lightly esteem this day, or how can they afford to forego its blessed privileges? Are not believers of this gospel age the children of Abraham by faith? And have they not all the signs of God's covenant favor confirmed unto them, and that with a deeper significance than "Israel after the flesh" could know? "If ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed and heirs according to the promise." Gal. 3:29.

All, therefore, that was given to Israel belongs pre-eminently to the Christian church. If then the divine law, with its Sabbath institution as a sign of God's covenant favor, was given to them, it has come to us as well, on the same authority, and as a sign to us also, of his covenant favor we believers, like fleshly Israel, having entered into similar covenant relationship with God. Nay more, when Israel sold their birthright of special divine favor and special privilege as the natural seed of Abraham, the seed of Abraham by faith became the heirs of that inheritance.

It may be and is presumed by some, and with what seems to them apparent Scriptural authority, that the divine law, of which this commandment is a part, is not binding upon Christians because it is written that "Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," (Rom. 10:

4), that he has blotted out the handwriting of ordinances that was against us and contrary to us and that he took it out of the way nailing it to his cross, (Col. 2:14.) "Wherefore," say some, quoting Paul, "we are no longer under law, but under grace." Rom. 6:14, 15.

These scriptures, however, do not prove that the divine law has passed away, but rather that God's covenant with Israel, based upon their perfect keeping of that law, has passed away, being superseded by the covenant of grace. Israel had for centuries been "under the law" in the sense of being bound by a covenant thus based upon it, God saying, "Ye shall keep my statutes and my judgments which, if **a man do, he shall live in them:** I am the Lord;" and Israel responding, "All that the Lord hath spoken **we will do.**" (Lev. 18:5; Rom. 10:5; Exod. 19:5-8). In the keeping of the law was their hope of life when they were thus **under** the law. But even the most devoted and faithful among them were unable to measure up to the full requirements of that law, so that not one of them ever gained the reward of that covenant except "the man Christ Jesus," who did keep it perfectly, and who therefore was acceptable to God when, as "a lamb without blemish and without spot," he "gave himself a ransom for all." I Tim. 2:5, 6; I Pet. 1:19.

No other man could keep that law in the full sense, because its requirements were the full measure of a perfect man's ability. Our Lord Jesus was "holy, harmless, undefiled and separate from sinners:" "he knew no sin" (Heb. 7:26; 2 Cor. 5:21) and had none of its entailments, while all other men were conceived in sin and shapen in iniquity (Psa. 51:5); and while

many of them bravely struggled against sin and tried to attain the perfection required in God's law, all, like Paul, realized that the law of sin and death working in their members hindered them from full compliance with the divine law, and thus made the keeping of their part of the covenant impossible. Rom. 7:15-25.

It thus became manifest that this law covenant which they had supposed to be unto life, and which was originally ordained to life, was really unto death, because of their inability to fulfil its requirements. (Rom. 7:10). This was just the lesson that God wanted Israel to learn from this law covenant. He wanted them to see that their hope of eternal life could never be realized on the basis of that covenant—by their own meritorious works; so that they might be able to appreciate, and to avail themselves of the privileges of the new covenant that should supersede it, based, not upon works of the law, but upon faith in Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world by the sacrifice of himself. John 1:29; Heb. 9:26.

Thus the law, with the old covenant based upon it, was, as Paul expressed it, a schoolmaster to bring Israel to Christ, who is "the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth," his righteousness being imputed to them by faith, and their sins being washed away in his precious blood shed for the remission of sins. (Rom. 10:4). It was the hand-writing of the ordinances of this law-covenant, and not the law itself, that was against and contrary to those who were under it, and which God blotted out and took out of the way, nailing it to the cross of Christ. (Col. 2:14). Wherefore **believing** Israelites are no longer under the law

in the sense of being bound by that old covenant which has passed away, but they are under the new covenant of grace, of favor, through Christ. (Rom. 6:14, 15). Whereas the old covenant said, "Do, and live!" the new covenant says, "Believe, and live." Believe in the finished work of Christ; for he has done for you what you could not do for yourselves.

While Gentiles never were under the law covenant, and being without the pale of its provisions, were without God and without hope in the world (Eph. 2:12), yet, believing Gentiles also, observing Israel's failure to win the reward of life by even their very best efforts to keep the law, learn from this observation, as God intended they should, the very same lesson that believing Israelites learned by experience, viz., that any hope of eternal life based on meritorious works of their own is vain; for the promise is only through faith in Christ, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin, not only of Israel, but also of the world: "For there is no difference between the Jew and the Greek, for the same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him; for whosoever shall call upon the name of the Lord shall be saved"—under the gracious provisions of the new covenant. Rom. 10:12, 13.

It should be observed further that, in the writings of the apostles and prophets, the term "law" is often used alone where the word covenant is also implied and understood. See, for instance, Rom. 6:14, 15; Heb. 7:19 and Col. 2:14. Note also Deut. 4:13. "And he declared unto you his covenant, even ten commandments." Here the terms "covenant" and "commandments" are used interchangeably. See also Deut. 9:11-15 where the two

tables of the law are called "the tables of the covenant;" and Exod. 34:28. "And he wrote upon the tables the words of the covenant, the ten commandments"—the words of the law upon which the covenant or promise of life and peace was based.

Thus we see that the thing that was ended, blotted out, put away, and nailed to the cross of Christ was not the divine law, but the old covenant based upon that law, which promised life only upon conditions of perfection as measured by that law; and not by its letter only, but by its very spirit, even as Christ magnified it and made it honorable. (Isa. 42:21.) The divine law never has passed away, and never will, as our Lord also intimated saying, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil." Matt. 5:17.

The fulfilling of the law by Christ comprehended not only his perfect obedience to all its moral precepts, but also the fulfilment in antetype of those typical features of the ceremonial law which prophetically pointed to him. Those features of the law end in turn as their antetypes appear. Thus for instance the typical sacrifices were to end when Christ, the great sacrifice, was offered upon the altar. But the moral law, contained in the ten commandments, never can be put away: in its very nature it is manifestly perpetual; it is the divine standard of righteousness, whose very spirit is love—love supreme to God, and to the neighbor as to self.

It is in the very midst of these divine statutes that this obligation of Sabbath observance is enjoined; and it should be observed that this and the three preceding commandments all relate to

our duties to our Creator. We must have no other gods before him, nor make any images for worship, nor take his name in vain; but we must remember him always, and observe with religious zeal and fervor one particular day in every seven for the special purpose of calling him to our remembrance and offering to him the grateful praise and adoration of our hearts.

The remaining commandments all relate to our obligations to our fellow-men. Thus, as our Lord summed them up, these first four commandments are comprehended in one, which he calls "the **first and great** commandment:" "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." The other six, relating to our human obligations, he counts as one, "the **second** commandment:" "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Matt. 22:36-40.

In this relationship of the commandments we see how important is this duty and obligation, as well as privilege of Sabbath observance; and no more can we annul this commandment than any other commandment of divine authority.

Avalon, Pa.



Mrs. A. M. Snow, of Kalida, Ohio, has been doing some work in the interests of the Crusade against the Mormon kingdom. Referring to her address at Ada, Ohio, the University Herald says: "The lecture on Mormonism, by Mrs. A. M. Snow, given in the Presbyterian Church, was well attended and marked by the earnestness and sincerity of the speaker. Mrs. Snow held the interest of her audience from start to finish by her eloquent appeal. She speaks from a sincere heart and with a zeal and intensity that carries conviction."

The National Reform Movement

THE MORMON KINGDOM

A STATE SECTARIAN SCHOOL

Newspapers from Utah indicate that the University of that State may be sued before the federal courts to secure the annulment of its charter on the ground that it is a sectarian institution. Fifteen professors have resigned. The main reason stated is that the institution is under a policy of repression. Among these professors are men of some national reputation, of long and proved fidelity to the cause of education and to the institution in which they have served from five to twenty years. The most important is the Dean, Bryon Cummings, who has acquired high standing among linguists and archaeologists because of his original research into the ancient ruins and races of America. The Mormon newspapers seem to have precipitated the idea that the controversy arises from a quarrel about church influence. Strange to say the papers on the other side disavow any intention to drag the church into the controversy. Obviously, however, the influence of high church men of the Mormon kingdom upon the affairs of the institution is the primary cause of the trouble. And the careful way in which non-Mormons are handling their side of the case indicates a more than tender regard for church power. The letters of the retiring professors show that the policy of repression has continued for some years; that they have become disheartened in their efforts to make the University an institution of free learning and of scholarly opinion;

that they have labored patiently, loyally and self-sacrificingly to this end; and that they give up at last because of the ignorance and fanaticism of the men who guide the affairs of the institution. The acute situation of today has developed from the action of the President, Joseph T. Kingsbury, in demoting a professor of English—a non-Mormon—and giving his place to a young Mormon bishop of no considerable experience and no standing whatever as an English scholar. The Mormon bishop was a brilliant young man, but his record or lack of record did not justify his being placed above an experienced and admittedly efficient professor of English, who had brought his department of the University of Utah into full recognition by the colleges and universities of the country.

The affair has assumed news proportions for the whole nation. If the suit shall be planted and prosecuted, a much larger question will be open than the affairs of the institution itself. In giving a large tract of land to the University of Utah, congress expressly stipulated that the school should not pass under sectarian control. If this condition has been violated and if the violation shall be proved, the University may lose its lands; and as a consequence of that proof and that loss, the domination of the Mormon church over the civil institutions of its kingdom will be made apparent once more. There is no doubt about such domination; but the Mormon kingdom denies, and tens of thousands of non-Mormons endorse

that denial by their silence, a silence which is enforced by reasons of prudence. The tyranny of the Mormon hierarchy was made plain in the Senate committee's report in 1906. At that time it was clearly demonstrated that Utah did not enjoy what the federal constitution guarantees to each Commonwealth, a republican form of government. But the people of this country are so busy with the events of each day and year that they overlook, sometimes, the gravest issues, if such issues are not constantly dramatized to their attention. A judicial inquiry by the courts of the United States into the affairs of the University of Utah may once more challenge the indignant attention of Christian citizens.



LETTER FROM THE GENERAL SUPERINTENDENT

James S. Martin

The past month has been one of varied, oftentimes trying, and withal most interesting experiences.

It has been spent, in company with the brainy and consecrated Senator Cannon, largely in interviewing personally men and women whose positions are such as to make them potent factors in the moulding of public opinion in the interests of the kingdom of God—ministers, missionaries, secretaries of mission boards home and foreign, editors, public educators, Christian attorneys, and not a few men prominent in business life. Our aim has been to lay before them the present status of the Mormon problem and enlist their co-operation in the effort to secure its speedy and peaceable solution—peaceable because speedy. For in the light of the history of Mormonism, if the aggressions of this literal, temporal, alien, hostile kingdom in our republic are not soon checked they will have to be checked at fearful cost and

sacrifice to the whole nation. We venture the assertion that the issue between the American republic and slavery was no more acute a score of years before the civil war than is that between it and the growing monster of Mormon iniquity in our midst at this hour. Abraham Lincoln in his day called the two evils "the twin relics of barbarism." We need to take warning from the awful cost to us of delay and compromise in ridding our country of the former of these evils and proceed at once to get rid of the latter.

We have to report that with few exceptions, very few indeed, all those interviewed in Pittsburgh, Philadelphia, New York and intervening points, are in hearty accord with The Platform and program of action outlined by the National Reform Association as a remedy for the present situation. A strong local committee has been formed in New York to assist in the effort to circulate this platform and carry out this program of action. The only reluctance we find, as a rule, to co-operate in our work is that which comes from the pressure of duties which the type of men interviewed are already obligated to perform. Inasmuch, however, as their influence is essential to the success of the crusade we are waging, we are prayerfully plodding on day by day disseminating information and securing approval in the hope and belief that not the few but the many of those seen will soon be actively enlisted in the warfare against the false, aggressive Mormon kingdom which is so antagonistic to the true kingdom of our Lord.

We have found it necessary to postpone for a little while some of the mass meetings previously arranged for in order to do some of the work above noted. It is something of a task to plan and direct with sagacity at every step a campaign whose developments are so many, rapid and important as the nation-wide crusade now being waged by our Association. We are, in reliance upon Divine help, performing the task to the best of our ability.

Within the month now closing we have personally interviewed many scores of influential American citizens both men and women, secured the hearty approval of the great majority of them and enlisted the hearty co-operation of not a few of the number. We have also addressed in various places—public halls, private homes, Y. M. C. A. and church buildings, etc.—hundreds, even thousands of others, practically all of whom voted heartily in favor of the resolutions embodying our program of action. We have also been endeavoring, with some hope of success, to lay a broad financial basis for the great work to be done within the next two years to bring the crusade to a successful issue. All in all we have reason to thank God and take courage.



LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE NATIONAL ORDER OF ANTI-POLYGAMY CRUSADERS

Mrs. Frances J. Diefenderfer

In attempting to prepare an article for publication in our magazine I am always troubled because I realize I must condense and thus take out much that is of very special interest in our work. The entire month of March was given to the far southwest, and an itinerary in any state so new as Oklahoma is most interesting indeed. The large cities are already assuming a metropolitan air, transient residents are moving on and people are becoming settled. During the month I reached most of the cities and large towns speaking before crowded houses.

In most cases the meetings were denominational because the itinerary was arranged under the direction of the Board of Missions of the Presbyterian Church U. S. A. A few mass meetings were held however that demonstrated great interest and enthusiasm. In Pawhuska, Enid and Ardmore I was invited to remain over the second evening speaking to large audiences. In Oklahoma city I had the opportunity

of speaking before the State Legislature, upon invitation of the speaker of the House and I very much appreciated the fact that so much interest was manifested. All business was set aside and I was given forty minutes during which time we presented the Anti-Mormon Resolutions that are so unanimously passed all over our country. Three large meetings were held in as many churches in Oklahoma City and in addition to these an address was given before the Women's Bible Class in the First Presbyterian Church, Sunday morning. In Ardmore an invitation came from the principal of the High School asking me to speak before three hundred pupils in the Auditorium and I was given the hour from 11 to 12 o'clock. Upon invitation the Judge of the court was present as well as the entire school board and several prominent citizens. It was a rare opportunity to tell the young people of Ardmore about the growth and development of Mormonism so near to them.

I visited Kendall College in Tulsa and spoke Sabbath morning to the student body and faculty in their chapel. Dr. and Mrs. Hawley are laying splendid foundations for the life work of young men and women in this college. The girls' dormitory is a beautiful building, finely equipped showing everywhere the beauty and refined taste and touch of art and comfort wrought out and developed by the cultured mind of Mrs. Hawley. In the afternoon the girls gathered around me in groups in a most informal way, some sitting on the floor in real Japanese style, others, more dignified, occupying divans, artistic window seats and chairs, while I told them about "Home Life in Utah" and young womanhood developed under very different standards than we knew and teach. I consider such opportunities God given and priceless in their value. At McAlester, Onadarko and Hobart splendid audiences greeted me. I made in all thirty-six addresses besides the several conferences and informal meetings held.

I also visited "Old Dwight" an Indian School under the care of Dr. and Mrs. Robe, Presbyterian Missionaries. This school is located near Marble City, Eastern Oklahoma and has students from the Creeks, Choktaws, Cherokees and Seminoles, all splendid young people. Many tribes of Indians in Oklahoma are immensely wealthy owning most of the rich oil and gas territory, but they know nothing of the means of developing these resources hence they become the easy victims of dishonest agents, immoral whites and grafting traders.

The real teaching of Mormonism is little understood in the state, though great interest was manifested and urgent invitations extended to return and tour the state again at my earliest possible convenience. I encountered some opposition in parts of the state where Mormon colonies are settled but generally they are considered a very undesirable element and are not welcomed in community life.



WATSON'S MAGAZINE AND THE CRUSADE AGAINST MORMONISM

Watson's Magazine is a monthly publication devoted to the waging of a campaign against Roman Catholicism. The issue for April contains an editorial article criticising the campaign of the National Reform Association against Mormonism. After quoting in full our programme of action the editor opens up his batteries against us. He first enumerates a list of evils which exist in Pittsburgh and other large cities, such as prostitution, the kidnapping of girls and selling them for immoral purposes, steelmill infernos, and evils connected with our various industries. These evils he says do not exist in Utah, and the implication is that the social and moral conditions prevalent under the sway of Mormonism are superior to those under the sway of other forms of belief. If this is not his meaning we fail to see any point to this part of the article. But there is good authority for the statement that the Mormon system does not

banish prostitution nor decrease the number of cases of this vice. Mormonism possesses no superior wisdom or skill in the management of economic questions. The cases of degradation and suffering among the Mormons are just as numerous in proportion to the population as in most other communities, and they are even more distressing. Mormonism possesses no magic power for the removal of either moral or physical evil. Neither is Protestant Christian civilization responsible for the evils enumerated which are prevalent in our great cities.

But all this is aside from the real issue. It seems designed to confuse and befog the minds of readers, and to imply that we condone the evils existing in our eastern cities while fighting those of Utah, an implication not sustained by a single fact.

Mr. Watson next asks a number of questions which may be all summed up in one, namely, Do we know anything about Roman Catholicism? which he considers the greatest existing menace to the American Republic. We might reply by asking him if he knows anything about the National Reform Association and the Christian Statesman. If he does he need not ask whether we know Catholicism. It is our special function to foe as thoroughly as we can all the foes of Christian civil government, and although we say it ourselves, we believe that what is said through our agencies is even more reliable than what is published in Watson's Magazine. Until his health failed Mr. DeLong, one of our Field Secretaries, devoted his time and strength to the exposure of the evils of Roman Catholicism, and wrote an illuminating book on the subject which was published by our association. In a short time we expect to show how the Roman Catholic hierarchy is a menace to our country, just as we are now showing the dangers from Mormonism.

Mr. Watson appears to hold that polygamy is sanctioned by the Bible and that to fight against it places a stigma upon Jesus Christ because some of his ancestors were polygamists. This

is very strange logic. God has furnished numerous arguments against polygamy. First, he gave Adam only one wife. Second, he so orders it that the numbers of the sexes are about equal. Third, in all the injunctions about marriage given in the Bible "wife" is in the singular number. Fourth, in the New Testament, polygamists were made ineligible to official positions in the Church. No stigma is placed on Christ by condemning polygamy, though some of his ancestors were polygamists. Doubtless all his human ancestors, from Adam to Mary, were sinners. But no stigma is placed upon him by condemning their sins. Adam broke God's command by eating the forbidden fruit. Noah was drunk at least once. Both Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob practiced deception. Judah was guilty of incest. Must we refrain from condemning these sins for fear of stigmatising Jesus Christ? What arrant nonsense. It is equally foolish to say that to condemn polygamy stigmatises Jesus Christ.

It is proper now to ask if Mr. Watson knows anything about Mormonism. He says it is American in its origin, laws, institutions and allegiance. It is American only in the sense that it originated in this land. In every other respect it is wholly un-American. It is a veritable kingdom controlled by a more compact, tyrannical hierarchy than rules Romanism. Its plan is to gain control of this country. It is working to this end just as truly as is Rome, and it has made more progress, since it actually has control in some states and holds the balance of power in others. Rome is truly a menace, and Mormonism is a menace. But at this juncture Mormonism is more to be feared than Rome. This is why we are waging the anti-Mormon crusade. We do not criticise Mr. Watson for opposing the Roman Catholic hierarchy. We wish him success and will give him our support. If he is wise he will show us the same courtesy.

CRUSADE NOTES

By a most regrettable mistake of typography which was not caught in the proofs, the Christian Statesman for April at page 174 presented an error in the letter of Hon. William E. Borah, Senator Borah's letter said: "I would fix April 1904." As printed in the Christian Statesman, it appears "I would fix April 1914." The context of the article shows clearly that 1904 was intended. In sixteen separate places in our comment upon Senator Borah's letter the Christian Statesman gives the date, 1904. Probably no careful reader will be misled by the misprint; but we hasten to make amends by this correction and we extend our regrets to Senator Borah for the error. However, for the benefit of our readers we remark, no argument by the Christian Statesman was based on the date of 1914. Our whole controversy with Senator Borah arises from his fixing the date as 1904, as given in his letter.

* * * * *

Mrs. W. P. White, of Los Angeles, Calif., has been working in the interests of the Anti-Mormon Crusade in Southern California. She spoke to the Brotherhood at the First Baptist church of Los Angeles and reports a large and enthusiastic audience, at which the "Resolution to the President of the United States" was unanimously adopted. She also spoke at the Calvary Presbyterian church, South Pasadena, before a sympathetic and appreciative audience where the resolution was again adopted.

* * * * *

A new friend, pledging financial support during the recent Chicago campaign, expresses her interest in this practical way: "Enclosed you will find remittance to cover my contribution for the entire year. There is certainly need of such legislation as you are working to obtain. I have realized it for a long time and am glad to know that practical efforts are being used to eradicate one of the crimes against our government, as well as against humanity."

Senator Cannon and the General Superintendent are at present in New York and Philadelphia in the interests of the Crusade. In addition to filling speaking dates they are personally interviewing many of the leading, influential citizens to secure their co-operation in the furtherance of the Crusade. They report encouraging progress.

* * * * *

A parlor conference in the interests of the Crusade was held in the home of Mrs. William English, Philadelphia, the afternoon of April 22. It was addressed by Senator Cannon and Dr. Martin. These same speakers addressed the Bible Class of the Brick Presbyterian Church, New York, on a recent Sabbath.

* * * * *

As another evidence of the awakening interest in the Crusade we submit to our readers the following just received from the Stated Clerk of the Presbytery of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

To the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.

The Presbytery of Council Bluffs met in the city of Council Bluffs, the old Mormon Kaneshville, where the evil effects of polygamy and other materialistic Mormon teachings still abide, to overture the General Assembly to memorialize the Congress of the United States to submit a constitutional Amendment forever prohibiting the teaching or practice of polygamy in any State and Territory thereof.

Done by the Presbytery of Council Bluffs, April 14, 1915.

Attest: J. E. Cummings, Stated Clerk

* * * * *

At the close of an address before several hundred ministers of the New York Clerical Conference the 12th of April, the Conference unanimously adopted the following:

"WHEREAS, The members of this Conference have heard with interest the address of the Honorable Frank J. Cannon, first Senator from the State of Utah, whose intervention

on behalf of the proscribed polygamous people of Utah had much to do with the elevation of that territory into a State, and,

"WHEREAS, The members of the Conference have learned in the progress of that address that covenants then entered into on behalf of the policies of the Mormon Kingdom in its relation both to the teaching and practice of POLYGAMY, and in regard to its participation in politics, have been persistently and flagrantly broken, and,

"WHEREAS, The Mormon Kingdom has been revealed to us as a Mohammedan-like blot upon the domestic institutions of America and a despotic danger to the freedom of the American political institutions, and,

"WHEREAS, Upon the State of New York, the birthplace of the Mormon Church, there rests especial responsibility to combat the continuance of this evil, therefore,

RESOLVED: That the Chairman of this Conference be empowered to appoint a committee of seven, which committee shall have power to add to its number, both from within and without the membership of this Conference, autonomous in its control, and charged with the special duty of procuring the passage in the Legislature of New York State, in 1916, of a concurrent resolution demanding an accounting to the Attorney General of the United States of the escheated properties returned to the Mormon Church upon its solemn vow and promise that polygamy should no more be condoned or practiced by it.

It is understood that the chairman of the committee of several named in this resolution is to be the Rev. Walter Laidlaw, Ph.D., Secretary of the New York Church Federation. It was he who secured the meeting of the Conference and presented the resolution.

* * * * *

Miss C. K. Swartz, Field Secretary of the Woman's Home Missionary Society of the Methodist Episcopal Church, who speaks frequently on Mormonism, gives the following interesting item in a recent letter sent us:

"I had a little excitement in Scranton, Pa. Something more than a thousand women attended our meeting there, including three Mormon contingents. These distributed themselves over the floor and gallery and came at me from various directions. I was however so well supplied with 'evidences' as to be able to put a quietus upon them all — 'organized' and 're-organized.' Some left the room, others remained to attempt to prevent those about them from hearing my remarks.

After I had left the city they came out in newspaper attacks, maintaining and attempting to prove that there is not now and has been no polygamy in the Mormon church since 1890. From clippings sent me I discover that this, and all other of the arguments used, was most effectively answered by a local woman who presented such an array of facts as should silence Mormon

controversy for all time to come. I specially appreciated this as it revealed to the Mormons as well as the public that our women are informed and have material with which to support their knowledge.

On May 16th, I am to speak on this subject in Sharon, Pa., where, I am told, is a growing Mormon colony."

* * * * *

Mrs. W. S. Mitchell of Indianapolis, Ind., affiliated with the Interdenominational Council of Women, recently introduced on the floor of the council the matter of the National Order of Anti-Polygamy Crusaders. Each organization represented was asked to assist in this great work by becoming a branch order of the Crusaders. A number spoke of the great need of co-operation, and it seems certain that out of this meeting there will grow many branch orders of our Women's Auxiliary. For many years Mrs. Mitchell has been interested in the Mormon problem and has given many parlor talks on the subject, speaking out of a personal acquaintance with the people of Utah as well as from a deep study of the whole subject.

PEACE BASED ON THE PRINCIPLES OF THE PRINCE OF PEACE

THE SILVER LINING OF THE BLACK WAR CLOUD

Henry Collin Minton

At the beginning of last August there broke out in Europe a great world-war which stunned the faith of the Christian community the world over. Civilization seemed bankrupt and the accumulated treasures of long centuries seemed imperilled and about to be lost. Whoever was to blame it was very clear that there was a great wrong somewhere. It was needless, it was foolish, it was wicked, it was a base

crime against God and against man. And yet the dogs of war were let loose and the furies of hate and hell conspired to do their worst. It was not only the horror of it; it was the diabolical wrong of it that stunned and almost stupefied the world.

But God often produces or permits mysterious results and in his providence brings to pass things alike inscrutable and inexplicable to human wisdom; but he does not always suffer the generation which witnesses them to disappear without some pretty distinct intimations of his divine wisdom and of his benevolent purpose and control. The

silver lining is not always so slow in making itself seen that faith in God is wholly without support in the world of sense or the gloom of the depression entirely unrelieved by blessings that have followed.

Certainly an intelligent and comprehensive review of this great war were yet not only premature—it is wholly impossible. And yet it is not too soon to be assured of certain results already being accomplished which have a decided and by no means unwholesome effect upon the current of international history and upon the moral interests of mankind.

First of all, it is too obvious to need remarking that War and Rum are the twin survivors of an absolescent political tyranny. They are both deadly foes of a true democracy. We speak not now of forms of government but of the spirit of intelligent self-direction which is the inherent and inalienable right of every civilized people. At the beginning this was not a people's war. We believe that half a dozen men could have averted it if they had so desired. Perhaps less than that number brought it on because they did desire it. We do not believe that the people of any one of the belligerent nations—certainly not any of the larger ones—were very deeply concerned in the interests that were involved in the initiating of the war. It is said, of course, that Germany is a fighting nation but we do not believe that, in the first instance, the great German populace wanted war. Bernhardt is vigorously repudiated by hosts of German writers as misrepresenting the spirit of the German people; though it must be said that the course of events in the Fatherland in the last eight months has been true enough to that great war-writer's programme to throw the burden of proof against their contention. It was quite otherwise, to be sure, after war had once been declared. Many a citizen and subject will say "no" to the proposal of war in general who will make haste to buckle on his armor and to reach for his musket when once the war-call has been sounded out. Loyalty

to their colors and to their crown is the ground for the valiant rallying on the field of arms. It is often an empty loyalty. Kings may know what they are fighting for, though even that is doubtful; but the people do not. The valor of the battlefield is an after thought and is unkindled until the war is on.

There is no doubt that the few who had the speaking of the decisive word knew this right well. The armaments of war, instead of safe-guarding peace, served as the open opportunity, and the accursed incentives to war. Diplomacy too often is subservient to the militia and when the war office says "we are ready," diplomacy at once brings about the justifying situation. Where militarism controls the regime the foreign office waits for the word of the war staff.

The world sees this to-day more clearly than it ever saw it before. And with this revelation comes another. It is the incalculable economic waste of the liquor curse. It is an awful price to pay for a lesson that seemed so plain and easy to be learned. War requires efficiency. The exaction is alike individual and national. Any subtraction from the maximum will tell immediately on the fortunes of war. And now the demonstration is indisputable and complete. Vodka in Russia, absinthe in France, beer in Germany and whiskey in Great Britain are not only moral forces against which parsons and priests may protest. They are also factors in efficiency with which war secretaries and generals must reckon and on which diplomats must shape their calculations. And thus when nations submit their disputes to the arbitrament of the sword, they are brought face to face with the vital economic fact that efficiency is reduced, strength is undermined and victory is snatched by the damning power of drink. If it took a world war to bring out that great truth, it is at great cost but who knows whether a less price would have bought the lesson? In any case the world knows it to-day. The economic aspect of the evil is not the

most important one but it is an aspect and the evil is many-sided and, once seen, it should never be forgotten. On the field of battle when life and death are in the balance, it is a poorly chosen time to fool the people. To-day the truths of temperance are written out in letters that men of many lands and languages can read and understand.

These two evils furnish the battle ground for the Christian forces of the twentieth century. Both are foisted upon an unwilling and an unresisting people. The war-lords and the rum-lords stop at nothing in the line of their unholy designs. War crimsones a continent with the best red blood of a generation and rum floods the homes of industry and peace with the tears of its helpless victims.

These are great truths which the world has been slow to learn but which, once learned, it will be slow to unlearn.

Then too the world sees the wickedness and folly of war as it never has seen it before. It is very significant, as Mr. Bryan himself has pointed out, that no one of the nations is willing to assume the responsibility of bringing on this war. Every country connected with it insists that another was the ag-

gressor and that it was driven into it in self-defense. The pen that had written that war was a biological necessity, that it has a value unique and all its own in the political and moral development of mankind, that weakness is the unpardonable sin of any nation, and a hundred other quotable maxims of ranting war-madness, has now so far modified its teachings as to assure us that the policy its nation has pursued and which it so strongly commends "has always been just, honorable, pacific and eminently fair to the weaker peoples" while this war has been forced upon such a policy by the malice of its enemies and by the insatiable greed and ambition of its envious neighbors.

The Supreme Court of the nations must, under God, always be found in the world's enlightened conscience. The fog will clear. This war is a cruel slaughter but it is not for naught. If war is hell, Europe is finding it to be so to-day as it never knew it before, and the heaven of peace,—righteous, honorable and permanent—never seemed so celestial as it seems in the upward-looking eyes of bleeding and prostrate Europe to-day.

THE BIBLE IN THE SCHOOLS CAMPAIGN

Following up the action taken by the Conference held in Pittsburgh November 30th, 1914, by which a number of organizations pledged themselves to co-operate in behalf of the Bible in the public schools, legislation has been proposed in a number of the States designed to safeguard the rights of the Bible to a place in the school room. In most if not all the States where such legislation has been proposed hostile forces have arisen and arrayed themselves against the movement. Of all these hostile forces the Jews are the most aggressive.

The Jewish Gazette of recent date speaks as follows about the proposed law for the State of New

York: "An insidious attempt is being made to introduce religion in the public schools of the State of New York. As stated by the Albany correspondent of the Jewish Daily News in its Yiddish columns yesterday, the Assembly Committee on Public Education has decided by a vote of 9-2 to report favorably the Tallet Bible Bill. The measure makes it mandatory upon the teachers in the State to read every morning during school session a portion of the Bible. Failure to do so may result in dismissal. There is only one thing to do. FIGHT THE BILL. It is mischievous, un-American and strikes at the very roots of the

principles upon which the United States has been founded. It is true that a clause of the bill provides that any parent objecting may withdraw the child from the classroom during the reading of the Bible, and this is the most harmful feature of all, for it creates a distinction between children, a distinction which will react unfavorably upon the parents. The object of the public schools is to teach the pupils to become good American citizens by impressing upon them the fundamental fact that 'all men are born free and equal'."

Aside from the mere statement that such a bill has been introduced into the New York legislature and that it contains certain features as specified, there is not a syllable of truth in the above quotation. The effort to safeguard the rights of the Bible in the school room is in no sense insidious. Instead of being "sly," "crafty," "intended to entrap or ensnare," it is frank, honest, done in the open, so that there is no excuse for any one being mistaken as to the nature and purport of the proposed action.

Instead of the measure being un-American and striking at the very roots of the principles upon which the United States has been founded, nothing could be more American and more in harmony with our fundamental political principles. The fathers who laid the foundations of our government journeyed to these shores in the light of the Bible principles of civil government and established the original commonwealths on the impregnable rock of Holy Scripture. It is only in recent years, since the uprising of a foreign element which is wholly out of harmony with our American institutions, that such utterances as the above have become common.

Once more, it is not true that the object of the public schools is to teach the pupils to become good American citizens by impressing upon them the fundamental fact that "all men are born free and equal." Where the expression, "all men are born free and equal," originated it might be impossi-

ble now to tell. The Declaration of Independence says, "all men are created equal." The two statements are not synonymous. Merely to teach either the one or the other of these dictums would never make good citizens either of America or any other country. There might be an equality among thieves and murderers, or even among the patrons of the dives that lead to hell. Something vastly more and different is necessary to make good citizens. Nothing short of the moral teachings of the Bible will do this. The proposed Bible legislation aims to round out and perfect the system of government whose foundations were laid by the fathers. But why fight this bill when the Charter of Greater New York makes Bible reading mandatory in the schools of that city?

The statement that the provision of the bill which allows those opposed to Bible reading in the schools to withdraw their children while this exercise is in progress "creates a distinction between the children" is the very reverse of the truth. It is based upon the fact that the distinction already exists. If our Jewish citizens wish this distinction wiped out or ignored by bringing us all down to the Jewish level it is time for all good citizens to take alarm and stand for genuine Christian citizenship. There is only one proper way to remove the distinction and that is for all parties to occupy the Christian platform. If the Jews are bound to keep up the distinction they should be willing to accept the consequences resulting from it, and not try to have it obscured by placing us all on a Jewish level.

* * *

A later issue of the same paper calls attention to the introduction of a similar bill in the Vermont legislature. In pledging his support to the efforts made to defeat the bill the editor says that it disturbs the peaceful relationship existing between citizens, that it introduces a religious test, and is unconstitutional.

As to those peaceful relations, it is pertinent to inquire, Who first disturbed

them? In Vermont as well as elsewhere the Bible has had a place in the public schools ever since there have been any public schools. The situation was peaceful till objectors arose and inaugurated a campaign against it. To start a fight and then pose as the apostles of peace is an old game often played by the foes of righteousness. All they want is their own way, and they are loud in charging those who oppose them with responsibility for the strife. Let no citizen of Vermont be deceived by this cowardly cry.

It is deceptive to say that the reading of the Bible in the school room introduces a religious test. The constitution of the United States forbids religious tests as a condition or qualification for filling official positions under the American government. To take this expression and use it as does the editor of the Jewish Gazette is to misapply and grossly to pervert its meaning. The Bible bill provides no religious test as a qualification for enrollment in the public schools or for entering any contest for school honors.

In maintaining the proposition that the use of the Bible in the public schools is unconstitutional the editor says that it is opposed to the constitutional principle of the separation of church and state. No objection to moral reform in the political sphere has been more thoroughly overworked than this. The phrase "union of Church and State" has a definite meaning. That meaning has been fixed by history. There is, and can be, no union of church and state except where some specified church organization is made the state church. It may have one of two definite forms. Either the state may be superior to the church, the king or emperor being head of the church by virtue of his office, as in the case of Russia and England, or the church may be superior to the state, as in the Roman Catholic theory. To speak of the use of the Bible in the public schools as of the nature of such union is a gross and unpardonable abuse of language, and displays crass ignorance of the essential facts in the case. The

objection proceeds on the false assumption that religion is something that pertains only to an ecclesiastical institution, and has no national relationships whatever. Surely a Jew should know better than this if he knows anything about the history of his own nation.

* * *

A bill similar to the two mentioned above has been introduced in the Ohio legislature. Petitions with many signatures have been laid before that body urging the passage of the bill. Recently however, petitions on the other side have been pouring in, mostly from Jewish societies. Opposition to the bill is based for the most part on the contention that it constitutes an infringement upon religious liberty and is a step toward the union of church and state against which the American government is committed.

Whose liberty is infringed upon by such a bill? No one is compelled or even asked to believe the Bible. Those who are opposed to it are even allowed to remain outside while it is being read. Since so much liberty is allowed those who disbelieve the Bible, would it not be fair to allow those who do believe it and regard it as essential to good citizenship to have it read? When liberty is the subject of discussion it must not be forgotten that claims can be presented by Christians as well as by Jews and infidels. The liberty of the latter class must not be pushed so far as to invade the liberty of the former.

* * *

As noted in these columns some time ago the National Education Association has offered a prize of \$1,000 for the best essay on "The Essential Place of Religion in Education, with an Outline of a Plan for Introducing Religious Teaching into the Public Schools." The Jewish Independent says, "In order to distance all competitors the editor of the Jewish Independent will submit his essay now. Here it is: "The essential place of religion in education is the home and the church. And here is a carefully prepared outline of a plan for

introducing religious teaching into the public schools: Dont! ! !'

The home is the first place for the teaching of religion; the church is another; the state is a third. This is so because each of these three divine institutions has need of religion, and sustains relations to God and the moral law. A Jew ought to know this if he has learned anything from the history of Israel.

* * *

A decision has been rendered recently by the supreme court of Louisiana declaring against the reading of the Bible in the public schools of that state. Our readers will doubtless remember the discussion in these pages almost two years ago of the McDonogh will case. The essential facts are these. John McDonogh was born in Baltimore but lived the greater part of his life in New Orleans. He became immensely wealthy. He died in the year 1850 leaving his property amounting to many millions to the two cities of Baltimore and New Orleans, to be used in establishing public schools. One condition was plainly written into the will, namely, that the Bible must be read daily in all the schools established by this fund. If the conditions were not accepted the money was to be otherwise disposed of. The writer in the year 1913 while in New Orleans looked up the will and became acquainted with all the facts in the case. New Orleans accepted its share of the bequest, and established more than thirty McDonogh schools, but the Bible has never been read in any of them. Dr. J. C. Barr of that city has been waging a campaign for some years to remove this stigma from the name of that city, but without success. The supreme court held that the conditions of the will are unconstitutional. But the strange thing about it is that the city officials will do a thing so dishonorable as to use the McDonogh money and fail to comply with the conditions prescribed in the will. If for any reason the conditions can not be followed the money should not be used, but should be turned over to the proper authorities to be disposed

of according to the conditions of the will.

The recent decision by the supreme court declares against the use of the Bible in the schools of Louisiana because in the opinion of the court such reading is unconstitutional. The syllabus of the decision is as follows:

"1. The constitution of the State of Louisiana provides that every person has the natural right to worship God according to the dictates of his conscience and that no preference shall ever be given to, or any discrimination made against any church, sect or creed of religion or any form of religious faith or worship.

2. The reading of the Bible, including the Old and New Testament, in the public schools of the State is a preference to Christians and a discrimination against Jews."

"The New Orleans States" publishes an interview with Dr. Barr on the deliverance of the court, in which Dr. Barr expresses the opinion that the decision does not absolutely prohibit the use of certain parts of the Bible to which Jews would not take exception. If this is the proper interpretation it is quite similar to the decision rendered a few years ago by the supreme court of the State of Wisconsin. We hope to lay before our readers in the near future a review of the decision from the pen of Dr. Barr who has so ably carried on a campaign in behalf of civic righteousness in his city and State.

As to the main contention of the court that the reading of the Bible is a preference to Christians and a discrimination against Jews, it is quite obvious to the mind that is acquainted with the whole history of our institutions that this is not a fair interpretation of the constitution. Such constitutional provisions were never intended to render our State governments colorless in the matter of religion. As a private individual or public official may be a Christian and still deal impartially with Jews and Christians, so may a government and its various institutions be Christian and not infringe upon the rights of any class. Jews are not

robbed of any of their rights if the Bible is read in the public schools, while Christians are robbed of theirs if it is not read.

* * *

Texas is one of those States whose supreme courts have rendered decisions favorable to the use of the Bible in the public schools. And yet there are prominent men in that State who maintain the absolute necessity of religious training for the welfare of the nation who advocate a policy which would completely nullify the excellent decision just mentioned. Prof. F. Eby, Ph.D., who is president of a Commission of the State Sunday School Association, has prepared a syllabus on the subject of religious education setting forth a plan whereby he thinks the desired end can be guaranteed. He holds that man is incurably religious, but that the American policy of separation of Church and State forbids the use of the Bible and the giving of any measure of religious instruction in the public schools. He proposes a method of co-operation between the home, the Church and the State so that both the secular and the religious interests shall be looked after. Religion is to be taught in the home and in the church schools, and the secular interests are to be taken care of by the public schools. But to make sure that the religious interests will not be slighted work done in Bible study under competent teachers will be recognized by the public schools and graded. Our opinion has been asked on the merits of this plan.

First of all, the plan has been in operation for some years in a number of our western states. There is nothing objectionable in the plan itself provided it is not used for the purpose of relieving the State of any part of its responsibility for the education of its youth. But whenever this plan is proposed as a solution of the whole problem of the religious and moral training of the rising generation and is designed to work in the interest of the exclusion of the Bible from the school room we are constrained to enter a most strenu-

ous protest. The plan, to be effective, must start with an alliance between Church and State, which is the very thing its advocates say must be avoided. If Churches and Sabbath Schools are to be depended on to furnish the moral and religious training needed by the State, how shall the State make sure that the task will be accomplished? Not more than half the children of school age are now enrolled in Sabbath Schools. These are the ones that most need religious training. Will the State enact a compulsory law requiring them to attend Sabbath School? If not how is the Church ever to reach them and give them the needed training? And if this is done would there not be established a real union of Church and State? But suppose it is said in reply, the home will be relied upon to do the necessary work in such cases. This however would never do, since such homes are utterly unqualified for it.

Again, the scheme if carried out would take from the State one of its essential functions, namely, the task of giving that rounded out instruction necessary for good citizenship. If the State needs religion, and we all agree that it does, it is not a union of Church and State if it provides for just that religious training needed. In fact this is the only sure way to avoid such union. There is of necessity a close union between religion and national life, as Prof. Eby admits when he advocates religious training by the Church for the benefit of the State. If there is no union of Church and State by reason of this vital connection of religion with national life there is no union of the two if the State itself teaches the principles of national religion and political morality.

• • •

THE CAMPAIGN IN CALIFORNIA

Dr. J. S. McGaw

One of the most encouraging features of the campaign for the Bible in the public schools of California is the excellent response received from the Women's Clubs of the State. Endorse-

ment for our constitutional amendment has been received from a numerical majority of all the clubs of the State. Replies to our letters have been prompt and hearty. Many more clubs will no doubt send in endorsements but have not yet been heard from owing to the fact that they have not held their regular meetings. The women of the State of California can carry the issue to victory if once they are fully aroused.

After persistent effort we were able to secure a public hearing on the evening of March 30 in the Assembly Chamber. Assemblyman T. T. Dennett introduced the amendment and made the opening address in which he said that his reason for introducing the measure was not alone to have the Book of books in every school where it ought to be, but to remove from the State of California the stigma of intolerance and bigotry toward the Bible which it assumes in the constitution as interpreted by the Attorney-General, U. S. Webb. He declared that the idea that the Bible is a sectarian book belonged to the middle ages rather than to the twentieth century. Rev. William F. Harrison, D.D., of the Westminster Presbyterian church of Sacramento, spoke on the Bible in the public schools as a time honored American institution which had been fundamental in the making of the Republic and giving to us the national character and institutions we to-day enjoy. He contended that there could be no effective moral training of the youth which was not accompanied by the Word of God. Rev. J. E. Squires of the International Reform Bureau presented the success that had been attained in other States in the use of the Bible in the school room.

The writer brought forward the proofs that this is a Christian nation as they may be obtained from our national history, colonial documents, decisions of the courts, resolutions of congress, messages and papers of the Presidents, Christian national institutions, customs and usages, together with the Supreme Court decision of 1892 declaring that

"this is a Christian Nation." Upon this foundation we proceeded to show that the Bible cannot in any true sense be said to be a sectarian book. The United States Government has never treated it as sectarian and it is out of all harmony with the national conception for any state to so regard it.

We also presented the necessity for the use of the Bible as a means of producing intelligent, moral, law-abiding and patriotic citizens.

The opposition was represented by a Mr. Osborne, pastor of the Seventh Day Adventist church of Sacramento, who spoke in behalf of the Religious Liberty Association, followed by a foul mouthed, blatant infidel who seemed to be known by no one but who made the opponents of the Book feel thoroughly ashamed that they were lined up on the same side with him.

Every member of the constitutional amendment committee was present and a goodly number of both the Assembly and the Senate together with many visitors. The occasion was well worth the effort and was an excellent opportunity for furthering the campaign of education in which we are engaged.

If the committee on constitutional amendments will not present this amendment to the assembly favorably, we will have it sent out without recommendation and voted on by the Assembly. Whatever may be the outcome of this session a telling advance has been made in the agitation of the subject and thousands have been awakened to its advocacy. In any case the campaign will go forward until the close of the election in 1916.

Besides a number of trips to Sacramento during the month we have visited a number of towns arranging for mass meetings and addresses.

An address before the Swedish Mission Conference in San Francisco was followed by enthusiastic endorsement of our work and the pledge to open their pulpits and give liberal financial support to the cause. Our Swedish American citizenry is a solid host for righteousness and rings true on all the

fundamentals of Christianity in the national life.

One of the most important of the many great meetings held in San Francisco in connection with the Exposition was the World Congress of Social Progress held under the auspices of the Committee of One Hundred which has charge of the religious work of the exposition. Dr. William M. Bell, Bishop of the United Brethren church, arranged the program and carried it through with signal success. The mes-

sage of the National Reform Association on the Christian Principles of Civil Government was considered so fundamental to the discussion of social progress that our subject "The Revival of Our National Religion and Social Progress" was placed next on the program with "The Church and the Challenge for Social Advancement" by Bishop F. J. McConnell, that together they might furnish a fitting climax to the wonderful eleven days of the study of social betterment.

TIDINGS FROM OUR SECRETARIES

OHIO

Rev. G. H. L. Beeman

The writer closed his work as field secretary of the National Reform Association for Indiana and Ohio last summer, accepting the charge of the Presbyterian church at Orrville, Ohio, the well-known junction point of the Pennsylvania, sixty miles southwest of Cleveland. During the last month or so before "settling down" again in the pastorate, it was my pleasure to address audiences in Columbus, Newark, Zanesville, Roseville, New Concord, West Liberty and Adams Mills, O., speaking upon "The Mormon Menace" and "The Bible in the Public Schools." At Wooster, Ohio, it was a great pleasure to address a thousand students of the big summer school. By request of the principal, Prof. J. H. Dickason, I spoke upon "The Mormon Peril."

Last fall—October—we had the great pleasure of hearing in our church at Orrville, Mrs. Frances J. Diefenderfer, in one of her great addresses against the evils of Mormonism. I have spoken of her work before meetings of Wooster Presbytery, and I trust we may have some hearings arranged for her soon in this part of Ohio.

There is a bill now in the Ohio Legislature to require the reading of the

Bible in the public schools. A friend in Columbus writes me: "I see the Jewish rabbi Kornfeldt of Columbus and one from Cincinnati, Phillipson, are working hard against the bill compelling Bible reading in the public schools. They seem to be even more aggressive than the Roman Catholics." This bill also provides for credits in the school course for Bible study done out of school under direction of ministers and others. But the daily reading of the Bible in every school is the one great feature of the measure, (and of course the thing most opposed). Our own church here, by a practically unanimous vote adopted a resolution in favor of the bill, but our county representative seems to be not in favor of it.

It is pleasant to be able to report that the superintendent of our schools here favors the use of the Bible in the schools. One night during the week of prayer he addressed a union meeting in our church and expressed himself then as strongly favoring its use in the schools. One morning when in the High School Assembly Room, it was very gratifying to the writer to see the principal pick up the Bible from his desk and read before the large school a passage of some length from the inspired Word.

Orrville, O.

MICHIGAN

Rev. W. J. Wilson

Your representative has been very busy during the past month organizing and further pushing the work for National Reform. Responses to our appeals have been more prompt than for some time past. Men and women on all sides are becoming interested in the questions of Mormonism and the place of the Bible in public education. The Damon bill, now before the legislature, bids fair to receive favorable treatment. There is little, if any opposition to it and this shows that the people at large are friendly to any enactment which will promote good morals and bring in a better citizenship. Both pastors and people have given me the fullest advantage in carrying forward our campaign against the Mormon kingdom.

March 21 I spent a delightful day at the United Presbyterian church of Birmingham. I found the leaders of that congregation awake to the questions of the day and especially interested in our anti-polygamy program. On the evening of March 21st, in Detroit, I spoke to the Ebenezer A. M. E. congregation on "Christian Citizenship." One of the pleasantest churches in which it has been my privilege to speak was the

First Methodist church of Holly. The pastor, Rev. C. S. Lee, prepared the way for April 11th, and a right good preparation it was. Mr. Lee had just emerged from the hot local option campaign that was waged in Michigan this spring, but he was just as ready to pitch into the Mormon kingdom crusade as though he had done nothing in three months past. He is a good fighter and I found him lined up on our side. April 18th was spent at Middleville and this was my second appearance in that thriving community. Rev. H. D. Bedford, pastor of the Congregational church, did everything in his power to make the occasion profitable and beneficial to the whole community. The Methodist pastor, Rev. J. H. Westbrook, came over with his congregation and joined in the evening service. I spoke on "Mormonism, Un-American" at the morning service and gave my lecture on the "European War" at the evening service before a crowded house.

The people of Michigan are certainly awakening from a long moral sleep and are in touch with the liveliest problems of the hour. Lieut-Governor L. D. Dickinson is one of the foremost advocates of temperance reform among us and, by the way, he is a warm supporter of our National Reform program as well.

ITEMS OF NEWS

TWO GREAT ASSEMBLIES

At San Francisco, California, and in connection with the Panama-Pacific Exposition, there will be held two great gatherings during the month of July, 1915.

The Ninth International Purity Congress, which meets July 18-24, is called by and will be held under the direction of the World's Purity Federation, with the co-operation of government officials, religious and reform associations. This Federation has been a potent factor in the creating of a high state of

sentiment and intelligence on the problems relating to public vice and contributory and allied evils which to-day make the consideration and open discussion of these questions possible, and demand chaste men and women, a single standard of morals and clean cities.

The International Lord's Day Congress is called to meet July 27-August 1, under the direction of the Lord's Day Alliance of the United States.

This organization has been instrumental in defeating scores of bills aimed against the Christian Sabbath,

and led the movement which closed the first and second class post offices on Sabbath thus giving a day of rest to 100,000 letter carriers and post office clerks throughout the United States. It secured the six-day week for the employees in the Engineering Division of Federal Buildings of the Port of New York. Referring to this, the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. W. G. McAdoo said it was "a desirable reform." The Lord's Day Alliance is largely engaged in educational and civic betterment campaigns for the defence of the Sabbath and Sabbath law enforcement.

The programs of both these assemblies will include addresses by eminent reformers, educators and religious workers, and there will be periods for open discussion and debate. The National Reform Association has been asked to furnish some speakers for each of these gatherings, and also to appoint delegates to represent the Association. The following appointments have been made:—Dr. Henry Collin Minton, Trenton, N. J.; Dr. James S. McGaw, Bishop William H. Bell, Dr. R. F. Coyle, Dr. J. C. Pinkerton, Dr. J. G. Kennedy, all of Los Angeles, Calif.; Hon. McKenzie Cleland, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. J. M. Wylie, Kansas City, Mo.; Dr. T. H. Acheson, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Mr. R. M. Downie, Beaver Falls, Pa.; and Dr. John H. Prugh, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Rev. J. R. Wylie, State Secretary of Pennsylvania, by the appointment of the Executive Committee, attended the hearing afforded the friends and opponents of the Williams Local Option Bill, House of Representatives, Harrisburg, Pa., on the 6th of April.

The President of the World's Purity Federation recently wrote our General Superintendent as follows: "I hope it may be possible for you to be personally present at our Ninth International Purity Congress in San Francisco next July, and if so I should like to give you a place on our program. I realize the value of the splendid work you have

done and I hope your health may be spared for many years to continue it. I do not wonder that your health gave away under the strain last summer. Those who do not have similar responsibilities little know the terrific struggle that is necessary to lead such a work as you have been guiding."

During the past month the Pennsylvania State Secretary has presented the cause of National Reform in Beaver Falls, Robinson, Clinton, Brownsville, Bentleyville, Hookstown, Mill Creek and Smith's Ferry, and reports good sized audiences and kind treatment wherever he preached. On the week days he has been interviewing ministers and business men in the interest of our work, stressing the fact that in order to succeed in any permanent reform the nation itself must stand right with God. On his return from Harrisburg he visited the towns of Lewisburg, Huntingdon, Tyrone, Juanita and Altoona and secured some engagements for the presentation of our cause at later dates.

The Chairman of the Committee in charge of the program for the Purity Congress writes: "I congratulate you upon the very excellent list of your appointees to the Ninth International Purity Congress in San Francisco next July. I will give a great deal if every one of these splendid men might attend the Congress and lend their very best cooperation and help to it."

Mrs. Susan McWhirter Ostrom, Superintendent of the Sabbath Observance Department of the National W. C. T. U., in a letter says:—"I am interested in the National Reform Association, the card of which you send. Your organization has surely outlined a great work and a much needed work. I feel that before long our whole nation will experience such a religious and moral awakening that even the best of Christians will be amazed, and I pray that God may hasten the day."